

Unmarried Parents & Cohabitants In Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

Compiled

by

Lawrence Cheeseman

Connecticut Judicial Branch
Law Libraries

2002 Edition

“All light is valuable on a darken path.”
DeQuincy

© 2002, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut. All rights reserved.

These guides are provide with the understanding that they represent only a beginning to research.

Contents

1 UNMARRIED PARENTS IN CONNECTICUT	5
§ 1.1 RIGHTS OF UNMARRIED FATHERS IN CONNECTICUT	7
§ 1.2 RIGHTS OF UNMARRIED MOTHERS IN PATERNITY ACTIONS	11
§ 1.3 DUTY TO SUPPORT CHILDREN	14
§ 1.4 CHILD CUSTODY ACTION	17
§ 1.5 CHILD VISITATION ACTION	21
§ 1.6 PARENT AS GUARDIAN	24
§ 1.7 TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS (TPR)	27
§ 1.7a <i>Rights of parents in TPR</i>	28
§ 1.7b <i>Right to counsel</i>	32
§ 1.7c <i>Standard of proof</i>	34
§ 1.7d <i>Equal protection of the laws</i>	36
§ 1.7e <i>Notice and opportunity to be heard</i>	37
§ 1.8 ADOPTION OF CHILD	39
2 COHABITATION IN CONNECTICUT.....	41
§ 2.1 COHABITATION WITHOUT MARRIAGE.....	43
§ 2.2 DURING DIVORCE	48
§ 2.3 FOLLOWING DIVORCE	52
3 COHABITATION AGREEMENTS IN CONNECTICUT.....	59
§ 3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	61
§ 3.2 VALIDITY	62
§ 3.3 GROUNDS.....	64
§ 3.3a <i>Expressed or implied contract</i>	65
§ 3.3b <i>Implied partnership agreement or joint venture</i>	69
§ 3.3c <i>Quantum meruit</i>	71
§ 3.4 FORM AND CONTENT.....	73
§ 3.5 REMEDIES & ENFORCEMENT	78

Tables

Table 1 Marital Presumption of Legitimacy	10
Table 2 Rights of the remaining parent in TPR.....	31
Table 3 Unreported Connecticut decisions on cohabitation without marriage	45
Table 4 ALR annotations on cohabitation without marriage.....	46
Table 5 ALR annotations on cohabitation during divorce	49
Table 6 Unreported Connecticut decisions on adultery during divorce	50
Table 7 ALR annotation on cohabitation following divorce.....	55
Table 8 Unpublished Connecticut Decisions: Cohabitation following divorce.....	58
Table 9 Proof of Existence, Terms, and Breach of Express Oral Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants.....	66
Table 10 Proof of Existence and Breach of Implied-In-Fact Contract for Services	68
Table 11 Proof of Implied Partnership Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants	70
Table 12 Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements.....	75

Figures

Figure 1 Motion for modification and/or termination of periodic alimony.....	56
--	----

1

Unmarried Parents in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

Definition:

- "The liberty interest at issue in this case—the interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children—is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by this Court [U.S. Supreme Court]. Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 120 S.Ct. 2054, 147 L.ed.2d 49, 56 (2000).
- "The father and mother of every minor child are joint guardians of the person of the minor, and the powers, rights and duties of the father and the mother in regard to the minor shall be equal." CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-606 (2001).

Sections in this chapter:

§ 1.1 RIGHTS OF UNMARRIED FATHERS IN CONNECTICUT	7
§ 1.2 RIGHTS OF UNMARRIED MOTHERS IN PATERNITY ACTIONS	11
§ 1.3 DUTY TO SUPPORT CHILDREN	14
§ 1.4 CHILD CUSTODY ACTION	17
§ 1.5 CHILD VISITATION ACTION	21
§ 1.6 PARENT AS GUARDIAN.....	24
§ 1.7 TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS (TPR).....	27
§ 1.7a <i>Rights of parents in TPR</i>	28
§ 1.7b <i>Right to counsel</i>	32
§ 1.7c <i>Standard of proof</i>	34
§ 1.7d <i>Equal protection of the laws</i>	36
§ 1.7e <i>Notice and opportunity to be heard</i>	37
§ 1.8 ADOPTION OF CHILD.....	39

Tables in this chapter:

Table 1 Marital Presumption of Legitimacy	10
Table 2 Rights of the remaining parent in TPR	31

Index

Unmarried Parents

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Adoption of child, § 8
 Adult child, duty to support, § 3
 AIDS, § 4
 Artificially conceived child, duty to support, § 3
 Balancing test, § 7b
 Care of child, § 1
 Child Support Guidelines, § 3
 Child support order, § 3
 Clear and convincing evidence, § 7c
 Clear and convincing test, § 7a
 Closed hearings, § 4
 Compelling disclosure of putative father, § 2
 Competency hearing, § 7b
 Constitution issues,
 Father, § 1
 Mother, § 2
 Contempt, motion for, §§ 4, 5
 Counsel, right to (TPR), § 7b
 Custody, § 4
 Death of parent, effect on rights of
 surviving parent, § 1
 Drug use by parent, § 4
 Due process, § 7a
 Duty to support children, § 3
 Equal protection of the law (TPR), §§ 7a, 7d
 Ex parte orders, § 4
 Family Relations Office, § 4
 Father (definition), § 6
 Fathers, unmarried, rights of § 1
 Fourteenth amendment (U.S. Constitution), § 7a
 Grandparents (adoption), § 8</p> | <p>Hearing, right to, § 1
 Joint guardians of person of the minor, Title page
 Liberty interest, Title page
 Maintenance (definition), § 3
 Marital presumption, Table 1
 Mental health of parent, § 4
 Mother (definition), § 6
 Mothers, unmarried, rights of § 2
 Necessities, child support, § 3
 Non-cohabiting parent, § 2
 Notice (TPR), right to, §§ 1, 7e
 Opportunity to be heard (TPR), § 7e
 Parent (definition), § 6
 Parent as guardian, § 6
 Pendente lite orders, §§ 4, 5
 Presumption re best interest of child to be
 in custody of parent, § 6
 Privacy of family, § 1
 Proof, standard of (TPR), § 7c
 Relative (definition), § 8
 Remaining parent in TPR, Table 2
 Retroactive child support, § 3
 Rights
 Father, § 1
 Mother, § 2
 Smoking, § 4, 5
 Standby guardian, § 6
 Support of children, § 3
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), § 7
 Visitation, § 5</p> |
|--|---|

Texts and Treatises

- ADOPTION LAW & PRACTICE (2001), §§ 1.2, 1.7a, 1.7c, 1.7e
 ANN M. HARALAMBIE, HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES (1993), §§ 1.7a-1.7e
 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH
 FORMS (2d ed. 2000), §§ 1.1-1.5
 6 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN, GEN. ED., FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE (2001), § 1.8
 BARBARA KAHN STARK, FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDE FOR CONNECTICUT (1998), § 1.5
 2 DISPUTED PATERNITY PROCEEDINGS (2002), §§ 1.1, 1.2
 DONALD T. KRAMER, LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN (2d ed. 1994), § 1.5
 FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT (1996), §§ 1.4, 1.5
 JOAN HEIFETZ HOLLINGER ET AL. ADOPTION LAW & PRACTICE (2001), vol. 1, § 1.1
 MIMI E. LYSER, CHILD CUSTODY: BUILDING PARENTING AGREEMENTS THAT WORK (1996), § 1.4
 PETER L. COSTAS, MANAGING ED., LAWYERS' DESKBOOK: A REFERENCE MANUAL, (2d ed. 2000), §§ 1.6,
 1.8
 RALPH H. FOLSOM & GAYLE B. WILHELM, INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN
 CONNECTICUT 3D (2001), §§ 1.6, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.8
 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002), vol. 5, §§ 1.1, 1.2,
 1.5, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.7c, 1.7e

§ 1.1 Rights of Unmarried Fathers in Connecticut

2002 EDITION

SCOPE:

Bibliographic resources relating to parental rights and status of unmarried fathers in paternity, termination of parental rights, adoption, custody, and visitation actions. Includes right to notice and counsel.

DEFINITIONS:

- “The father and mother of every minor child are joint guardians of the person of the minor, and the powers, rights and duties of the father and the mother in regard to the minor shall be equal. If either father or mother dies or is removed as guardian, the other parent of the minor child shall become the sole guardian of the person of the minor.” CONN. GEN. STAT. §45a-606 (2001)

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - § 45a-606. Father and mother joint guardians.
 - § 46b-61. Orders re children where parents live separately
 - § 46b-215. Relatives obliged to furnish support, when. Orders.

COURT RULES

- CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK (2002 EDITION)
 - Chapter 25 *Superior Court - Procedure in Family Matters*
 - § 25-3. Action for custody of minor children
 - § 25-4. Action for visitation of minor child

CASES:

- **U.S. Supreme Court**
 - Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 120 S.Ct. 2054, 147 L.ed.2d 49, 58 (2000). “Accordingly, so long as a parent adequately cares for his or her children (*i.e.*, is fit), there will normally be no reason for the State to inject itself into the private realm of the family to further question the ability of that parent to make the best decisions concerning the rearing of that parent's children.”
 - Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, 658, 92 S. Ct. 1208, 31 L.Ed. 2d 551 (1972). “The State of Illinois assumes custody of the children of married parents, divorced parents, and unmarried mothers only after a hearing and proof of neglect. The children of unmarried fathers, however, are declared dependent children without a hearing on parental fitness and without proof of neglect. Stanley’s claim in the state courts and here is that failure to afford him a hearing on his parental qualifications while extending it to other parents denied him equal protection of the laws. We have concluded that all Illinois parents are constitutionally entitled to a hearing on their fitness before their children are removed from their custody.”
 - Caban v. Mohammed, 441 U.S. 380, 99 S.Ct. 1760, 60 L.Ed. 2d 297 (1979).
 - Quilloin v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 246, 98 S.Ct. 549, 54 L.ed.2d 511 (1978).
 - Lehr v. Robertson, 463 U.S. 248, 266-267, 103 S.Ct. 2985, 77 L.Ed. 2d 614 (1983). “the existence or nonexistence of a substantial relationship between parent and child is a relevant criterion in

evaluating both the rights of the parent and the best interests of the child We therefore found that a Georgia statute that always required a mother’s consent to the adoption of a child born out of wedlock, but required the father’s consent only if he had legitimated the child, did not violate the Equal Protection Clause We have held that these statutes may not constitutionally be applied in that class of cases where the mother and father are in fact similarly situated with regard to their relationship with the child.”

- **Connecticut**

- Roth v. Weston, 259 Conn. 202, 205, 789 A. 2d 431 (2002). “We conclude that the statute is unconstitutional as applied to the extent that the trial court, pursuant to the statute, permitted third party visitation contrary to the desires of a fit parent and in the absence of any allegation and proof by clear and convincing evidence that the children would suffer actual, significant harm if deprived of the visitation.”
- Weidenbacher v. Duclos, 234 Conn. 51, 661 A.2d 988 (1995). See [Table 1](#)

**WEST KEY
NUMBER:**

- Children out-of-wedlock
 - # 20 Custody
 - # 21-23 Support
 - # 30-79 Paternity proceedings

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 41 AM JUR 2D *Illegitimate Children* (1995).
 - § 91. Support, duty of putative father
 - § 99. Custody, rights of father
 - § 100. Visitation, rights of father
- Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, *Right Of Putative Father To Visitation With Child Born Out Of Wedlock*, 58 ALR5th 669 (1998).
- Russell G. Donaldson, Annotation, *Natural Parent’s Parental Rights As Affected By Consent To Child’s Adoption By Other Natural Parent*, 37 ALR4th 724 (1985).
- Annotation, *Comment Note—Right Of Natural Parent To Withdraw Valid Consent To Adoption Of Child*, 74 ALR3d 421(1976).
- W.E. Shipley, Annotation, *Woman’s Right To Have Abortion Without Consent Of, Or Against Objections Of, Child’s Father*, 62 ALR3d 1097 (1975).
- W.E. Shipley, Annotation, *Death Of Putative Father As Precluding Action For Determination Of Paternity Or For Child Support*, 58 ALR3d 188 (1974).
- Thomas J. Goger, Annotation, *Rights Of Putative Fathers To Custody Of Illegitimate Child*, 45 ALR3d 216 (1972).
- Annotation, *Necessity Of Securing Consent Of Parents Of Illegitimate Child To Its Adoption*, 51 ALR2d 497 (1957).

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
 - Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried cohabitants
- 5 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002).
 - Chapter 30 Rights of putative fathers to custody and visitation

- § 30.02. The putative father's standing to seek custody of his child
- § 30.03. Rights of the putative father vs. the natural mother
- § 30.04. Rights of the putative father vs. a non-parent
- § 30.05. Rights of the putative father to visitation
- § 30.06. Right of the putative father to have his child bear his surname
- 2 DISPUTED PATERNITY PROCEEDINGS (2002).
 - Chapter 27. The rights of putative fathers
 - § 27.02 The constitutional foundation
 - § 27.03. The constitutional implications of the protections of putative fathers and the extent of those rights in particular cases
 - [2]. Paternity actions
 - [3]. Custody and visitation
 - [4]. Adoptions, termination of parental rights, and notice issues
- 1 JOAN HEIFETZ HOLLINGER ET AL. ADOPTION LAW & PRACTICE (2001).
 - §2.04[2]. Status of unwed fathers in adoption proceedings
 - [a] The traditional rule
 - [b] Recent constitutional cases extending rights to unwed fathers
 - [c] Determining the need for consent from unwed fathers

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 1 Marital Presumption of Legitimacy

<h2 style="text-align: center;">Marital Presumption of Legitimacy in Connecticut</h2>	
Definition	a "presumption of legitimacy," . . . postulates that a child born in wedlock is presumed to be a legitimate child of the mother and her husband. <u>Weidenbacher v. Duclos</u> , 234 Conn. 51, 68-69, 661 A.2d 988 (1995)
Rebuttable	" . . . we have held that this presumption may be rebutted by a person who presents clear, convincing and satisfactory evidence that the mother's husband is not the child's natural father Indeed, we have not limited or restricted in any way the class of persons who may present such proof and thereby overcome the presumption." Ibid, p. 69.
Not a per se bar	"In sum, there is no persuasive reason today to deny the putative father of a child born in wedlock the opportunity to rebut the presumption of legitimacy. Accordingly, we hold that the mere fact that a child was born while the mother was married is not a per se bar that prevents a man other than her husband from establishing standing to bring an action for a writ of habeas corpus for custody of or visitation with a minor child." Ibid., pp. 73-74.
	"In deciding whether the putative father has standing, the trial court, on the basis of all the evidence before it, must determine whether the putative father has established that his interests and the best interests of the child outweigh those of the marital family unit." Ibid., pp. 76-77
Twofold task	"In accordance with our precedents, the petitioner has a twofold task ahead. First, he must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that he is the biological father Second, the petitioner must prove to the trial court that it is in the best interests of . . . [the child] that he be awarded custody or visitation. Ibid., p.78

§ 1.2 Rights of Unmarried Mothers in Paternity Actions

2002 EDITION

SCOPE:

Bibliographic resources relating to parental rights and status of unmarried mothers in paternity actions.

DEFINITIONS:

- “The father and mother of every minor child are joint guardians of the person of the minor, and the powers, rights and duties of the father and the mother in regard to the minor shall be equal. If either father or mother dies or is removed as guardian, the other parent of the minor child shall become the sole guardian of the person of the minor.” CONN. GEN. STAT. §45a-606 (2001)
- "Once alleged parental rights of the father have been adjudicated in his favor under subsection (b) of this section, or acknowledged as provided for under section 46b-172, **his rights and responsibilities shall be equivalent to those of the mother**, including those rights defined under section 45a-606." CONN. GEN. STAT. §46b-172a(g) (2001) (emphasis added).
- **Compelling disclosure:** “If the mother of any child born out of wedlock, or the mother of any child born to any married woman during marriage which child shall be found not to be issue of the marriage terminated by a decree of divorce or dissolution or by decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, fails or refuses to disclose the name of the putative father of such child under oath to the Commissioner of Social Services, if such child is a recipient of public assistance, or to a selectman of a town in which such child resides, if such child is a recipient of general assistance, or otherwise to a guardian or a guardian ad litem of such child, such mother may be cited to appear before any judge of the Superior Court and compelled to disclose the name of the putative father under oath and to institute an action to establish the paternity of said child.” CONN. GEN. STAT. §46b-169(a) (2001).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - § 45a-606. Father and mother joint guardians.
 - § 46b-61. Orders re children where parents live separately
 - § 46b-160. Petition by mother or expectant mother
 - § 46b-169. Compelling disclosure of name of putative father. Institution of action
 - § 46b-215. Relatives obliged to furnish support, when. Orders.

COURT RULES

- CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK (2002 EDITION)
 - Chapter 25 *Superior Court - Procedure in Family Matters*
 - § 25-68. Right to counsel in State initiated paternity actions

CASES:

- Stevens v. Leone, 35 Conn. Supp. 237, 239-240, 406 A.2d 402 (1979). "It seems obvious from the remarks of the chairman of the house judiciary committee at the time that the amendment [Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46b-61] was introduced that it was the intent of the legislature to expand the jurisdiction of the Superior Court regarding custody issues from controversies arising out of a dissolution of marriage to controversies in which a child had been born without benefit of marriage."

DIGESTS:

- ALR INDEX: *Legitimacy of children*
- ALR DIGEST: *Children Out-of-Wedlock*
- CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Paternity*

**WEST KEY
NUMBER:**

- Children out-of-wedlock
 - # 20 Custody
 - # 21-23 Support
 - # 30-79 Paternity proceedings

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 41 AM JUR 2D *Illegitimate Children*
 - §97. Rights of mother, generally
 - § 98. —Loss of mother's right
- 14 C.J.S. *Children Out-Of-Wedlock* (1991).
 - § 34. Custody in general
 - § 35. Parent and nonparent
 - § 36. Change of custody between parents
 - § 37. Mother
- David M. Holliday, Annotation, *Paternity Proceedings: Right To Jury Trial*, 51 ALR4th 565 (1987).
- Annotation, *Natural Parent's Parental Rights As Affected By Consent To Child's Adoption By Other Natural Parent*, 37 ALR4th 724
- Annotation, *Right Of Natural Parent To Withdraw Valid Consent To Adoption Of Child*, 74 ALR3d 421
- Annotation, *Necessity Of Securing Consent Of Parents Of Illegitimate Child To Its Adoption*, 51 ALR2d 497 (1957).
- *Cause Of Action On Behalf Of Child Or Mother To Establish Paternity*, 6 COA2d 1 (1994).
 - Plaintiff's case for paternity
 - § 4. Generally
 - § 5. Mother's sexual intercourse with defendant
 - § 6. —Intercourse during period of child's conception
 - § 7. Absence of intercourse with other men
 - § 8. Child's biological affinity to defendant

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
 - § 42.2. Rights of Unmarried or Non-cohabiting Parents
- 5 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002).
 - Chapter 30. Rights of putative fathers to custody and visitation
 - § 30.03 Rights of the putative father vs. the natural mother
- 2 DISPUTED PATERNITY PROCEEDINGS (2002).
 - Chapter 27. The rights of putative fathers
 - § 27.02 The constitutional foundation
 - § 27.03 Adoption, termination of parental rights, paternity, custody and visitation. Right to notice. Right to counsel.
- 1 ADOPTION LAW & PRACTICE (2001).
 - § 2.04[2]. Status of unwed fathers in adoption proceedings

PAMPHLETS:

- Establishing Paternity: Questions and Answers for Dads
<http://www.dss.state.ct.us/pubs/patdad.pdf>

LAW REVIEWS:

- Aviam Soifer, *Parental Autonomy, Family Rights and The Illegitimate: A Constitutional Commentary*, 7 CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW 1 (1974).

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.3 Duty to Support Children

2002 EDITION

SCOPE:

Bibliographic resources relating to the duty of an unmarried parent to support child including child who are adopted.

DEFINITIONS:

- “The independent nature of a child’s right to parental support was recognized by this court long before that right was codified in our statutes.” Guillev v. Guillev, 196 Conn. 260, 263, 492 A.2d 175 (1985).
- Child support order “does not operate to crystallize or limit the duty of the parent to support his minor child, but merely defines the extent of the duty during the life of the order.” Rosher v. Superior Court, 71 P.2d 918.
- **Maintenance.** “Under General Statutes . . . [§] 46b-84, the court is authorized to make orders regarding the maintenance of the minor children of the marriage. The word ‘maintenance’ means ‘the provisions, supplies, or funds needed to live on.’ *Webster, Third New International Dictionary*. It is synonymous with support . . . Such orders may be in kind as well as in money.” Valente v. Valente, 180 Conn. 528, 532, 429 A.2d 964 (1980).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - § 46b-56. Superior court orders re custody and care
 - § 46b-58 Custody, maintenance and education of adopted children
 - § 46b-61. Orders re children where parents live separately
 - § 46b-215. Relatives obliged to furnish support, when. Orders.

CASES:

- Unkelbach v. McNary, 244 Conn. 350, 357, 710 A.2d 717 (1998). “The [Child Support] guidelines are predicated upon the concept that children should receive the same proportion of parental income that they would have received had the family remained intact . . . Toward that end, the guidelines are income driven, rather than expense driven.”
- State v. Miranda, 245 Conn. 209, 222, 715 A.2d 680 (1998). “It is undisputed that parents have a duty to provide food, shelter and medical aid for their children and to protect them from harm.”
- Delahunty v. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 236 Conn. 582, 602, 674 A.2d 1290 (1996). “Child support is based on the duty of the parents to maintain their minor children and is determined by a variety of factors including, but not limited to, the needs of the child and level of income of the parents.”
- In Re Bruce R., 234 Conn. 194, 209, 662 A.2d 107 (1995). “Connecticut child support legislation clearly evinces a strong state policy of insuring that minor child receive the support to which they are entitled.”
- Timm v. Timm, 195 Conn. 202, 207, 487 A.2d 191 (1985). “It is further recognized that an order for the support of minor children is not based solely on the needs of the children but takes into account what the parents can afford to pay.”
- Sillman v. Sillman, 168 Conn. 144, 358 A.2d 150 (1975). *Support and the age of majority*.

DIGESTS:

- DOWLING’S DIGEST: *Parent and Child* § 5. Liability of Parent. Support.
- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS:

CHILD SUPPORT, alteration, change, or amendment
—Parents

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Parent & Child* # 3.1. Support and education of child. Rights, duties and liabilities in general
 - (2) Father, duty to support
 - (3) Mother, duty to support

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 59 AM JUR 2D *Parent and Child* (2002).
 - §§ 45-78. Support and maintenance of child, in general; Liability for expenses regarding child
 - § 55. Obligations of respective parents
 - § 56. —Father of child artificially conceived
 - § 57. —When one parent fraudulently misrepresents facts regarding sterility or birth control
 - § 58. —Effect of parent's death; mother as surviving parent
 - § 59. Liability of parent separated from child
 - § 60. —When separation by act of other parent
 - § 61. —When separation by act of child
 - § 62. —When separation by judicial decree
 - Liability of parents for necessities of child**
 - § 66. Generally
 - § 67. Child living apart from parent
 - § 68. Medical and dental services
 - Liability of parents for particular types of expenses**
 - § 69. Education
 - § 70. —Amount and kind; higher education
 - § 71. Medical and dental care
 - § 72. Funeral expenses
 - Rights and duties of parent as to adult child**
 - § 76. Generally
 - § 77. Support of adult child
 - § 78. —Child unable to support self
- Jeffrey W. Santema, *Liability Of Father For Retroactive Child Support On Judicial Determination Of Paternity*, 87 ALR5th 361 (2001).
- Marjorie A. Caner, Annotation, *Support Provisions Of Judicial Decree Or Order As Limit Of Parent's Liability For Expenses Of Child*, 35 ALR5th 757 (1996).
- Anne M. Payne, Annotation, *Parent's Child Support Liability As Affected By Other Parent's Fraudulent Misrepresentation Regarding Sterility Or Use Of Birth Control, Or Refusal To Abort Pregnancy*, 2 ALR5th 337 (1992).
- Anne M. Payne, Annotation, *Sexual Partner's Tort Liability To Other Partner For Fraudulent Misrepresentation Regarding Sterility Or Use Of Birth Control Resulting In Pregnancy*, 2 ALR5th 301 (1992).
- Joel E. Smith, Annotation, *Parent's Obligation To Support Unmarried Minor Child Who Refuses To Live With Parent*, 98 ALR3d 334 (1980).
- J.A. Bryant, Jr., Annotation, *Parent For Support Of Child Institutionalizes By Juvenile Court*, 59 ALR3d 636 (1974).

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
 - Chapter 38. Child support
 - § 38.1. Duty to support child
 - § 38.2 Statutory duty to support

§ 38.4. Child to whom duty of support applies
§ 38.7. Adopted children
§ 38.8. Illegitimate children
§ 38.9. _____ Presumption of paternity
§ 38.11. Support claim not based on birth or adoption

LAW REVIEWS:

- Arthur E. Balbirer, *Rights And Obligations Of Custodial And Non-Custodial Parents In Connecticut*, 53 CONNECTICUT BAR JOURNAL 356 (1979).

COMPILER:

Compiled by Lawrence Cheeseman, Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.4 Child Custody Action

2002 Edition

SCOPE:

Bibliographic resources relating to child custody and unmarried parents, form preparation and procedure in custody actions where parents are unmarried or live separately, and the factors considered in awarding custody.

SEE ALSO:

[Best Interest of the Child Standard in Connecticut](#)

STATUTES:

CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001).

- Chapter 319o *Department of Social Services*
 - § 17b-27. Voluntary acknowledgment of paternity program.
- Chapter 802h, Part II *Guardians of the Person of the Minor*, §§45a-603 et seq.
 - § 45a-606. Father and mother joint guardians.
 - § 45a-607. Temporary custody of minor pending application to probate court for removal of guardian or termination of parental rights.
- Chapter 815j *Dissolution of Marriage, Legal Separation and Annulment*
 - § 45b-56. Superior Court orders re custody, care and therapy of minor children in actions for dissolution of marriage, legal separation and annulment...
 - § 46b-61. Orders re Children where parents live separately.
 - § 46b-64. Orders of court prior to return day of complaint.
 - § 46b-66. Review of agreements; incorporation into decree.
 - § 46b-69b. Parenting Education Program. Required.
- Chapter 815p *Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction & Enforcement Act*
 - § 46b-115a. Definitions
 - § 46b-115m. Modification of custody determination of another state
 - § 46b-115w. Procedure for registering an out-of-state child custody order
 - §§ 46b-115x to 46b-115gg. Procedure for enforcement of child custody determination
- Chap. 815y, *Paternity Matters*, §§46b-160 et seq.
 - § 46b-172. Acknowledgment of paternity and agreement to support. [amended by 1999 CONN. ACTS 193 §7]
 - § 46b-172a. Claim for paternity by putative father ... Rights and responsibilities upon adjudication or acknowledgment of paternity. [amended by 1999 CONN. ACTS 193 §7]
- Chapter 816 Support Part II *Obligations of Relatives*
 - § 46b-215. Relatives obliged to furnish support, when.
 - § 46b-215(b). Attorney General as party to the case when person is receiving public assistance.

COURT RULES

[CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK \(2002 ed.\)](#)

- Chapter 25 *Superior Court - Procedure in Family Matters*
 - § 25-3. Action for Custody of Minor Child
 - § 25-5. Automatic Orders Upon Service of Complaint
 - § 25-24. Motions
 - § 25-28. Order of Notice

§ 25-30. Statements to be Filed (Financial Affidavits)
 § 25-34. Procedure for Short Calendar
 § 25-38. Judgment Files
 § 25-57. Affidavit Concerning Children
 § 25-59. Closed Hearings and Records
 § 25-60 & § 25-61. Family Division Evaluations and Studies
 § 25-62. Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

**LEGISLATIVE
HISTORY:**

- Public Acts 1974, No. 74-169, §12, 17 H.R. Proc., Pt. 6, 1974 Sess., p. 2805 [Conn. Gen. Stat. §46b-61]
 “...expands the jurisdiction of the superior court involving minor children and further states that the section can be used in controversies not only involving a husband and wife but in controversies involving parents of minor children or children if they are no longer married or were never married.”

OFFICIAL FORMS

FORMS:

- VS-56 Acknowledgment of Paternity
- VS-57 Recision of Acknowledgment of Paternity
- JD-CL-12 Appearance
- JD-FM-75 Application for Waiver of Fees
- JD-FM-161 Custody / Visitation Application
- JD-FM-162 Order to Attend Hearing and Notice to the Defendant
- JD-FM-158 Notice of Automatic Orders
- JD-FM-164 Affidavit Concerning Children
- JD-FM-164A Addendum to Affidavit Concerning Children
- JD-FM-167 Motion for Notice by Publication or Mail in Family Cases
- JD-FM-168 Order of Notice by Publication or Mail in Family Cases
- JD-FM-175 Certification of Notice in Family Cases (Public Assistance)
- JD-FM-178 Affidavit Concerning Military Service
- JD-FM-183 Custody/Visitation Agreement
- JD-FM-6 Financial Affidavit
- JD-FM-176 Motion for Orders Before Judgment (Pendente Lite)
- JD-FM-173 Motion for Contempt
- JD-FM-174 Motion for Modification

UNOFFICIAL FORMS

- Temporary or Pendente Lite Orders
 - BARBARA KAHN STARK ET AL., FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDEBOOK FOR CONNECTICUT 370-374 (1998)
 - MARY ELLEN WYNN & ELLEN B. LUBELL, HANDBOOK OF FORMS FOR THE CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAWYER 106-116 (1991)
- Modification of Automatic Orders
 - BARBARA KAHN STARK ET AL., FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDEBOOK FOR CONNECTICUT 369 (1998)
 - REPRESENTING YOURSELF IN A CUSTODY CASE: A HOW TO DO IT YOURSELF BOOKLET, Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut, Sample 4.
- Exparte Orders
 - MARY ELLEN WYNN & ELLEN B. LUBELL, HANDBOOK OF FORMS FOR THE CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAWYER 145-150 (1991)
- Judgment
 - Representing Yourself in a Custody Case: A How to Do it Yourself Booklet*, Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut, Sample 19

& Sample 20.

CASES:

- Knock v. Knock, 224 Conn. 776,788, 621 A.2d 267 (1993). “Section 46b-56(b) does not require that the trial court award custody to whomever the child wishes; it requires only that the court take the child’s wishes into consideration.”
- Ridgeway v. Ridgeway, 180 Conn. 533, 541, 429 A.2d 801 (1980). “In this case, the evidence showed that the children were living in a familiar and stable environment with love and attention from their paternal grandparents; that the plaintiff at times had an adverse effect upon the children; and that the plaintiff’s psychological instability was such that it posed a threat to the children’s well-being.”
- Stevens v. Leone, 35 Conn. Supp. 237, 239, 406 A.2d 402 (1979). “It seems obvious ... that it was the intent of the legislature to expand the jurisdiction of the Superior Court regarding custody issues from controversies arising out of a dissolution of marriage to controversies in which a child had been born without benefit of marriage.”
- Rudolewicz v. Rudolewicz, Superior Court, judicial district of Hartford at New Britain, Docket No. 410812 (August 20, 1986), 1 C.S.C.R. 664, 666.
20 factors the court should consider when determining the “best interest of the child”

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Children Out-of-Wedlock* # 20.1– # 20.13
 - # 20.1. Rights of mother
 - # 20.2. Rights of father
- *Child Custody* # 20 – # 88 Grounds and factors in general
- *Infants* # 19
 - # 19.2. Matters considered in awarding custody
 - # 19.3. Determination of right to custody

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, *Child Custody and Visitation Rights Arising From Same-Sex Relationship*, 80 ALR5th 1 (2000).
- Linda A. Francis, Annotation, *Mental Health of Contesting Parent as Factor in Award of Child Custody*, 53 ALR5th 375 (1997).
- Elizabeth Trainor, Annotation, *Initial Award or Denial of Child Custody to Homosexual or Lesbian Parent*, 62 A.L.R. 5th 591 (1998).
- Harriet Dinigar Milks, Annotation, *Smoking as Factor in Child Custody and Visitation Cases*, 36 ALR5th 377 (1996).
- Danny R. Veilleux, Annotation, *Age of Parent as Factor in Awarding Custody*, 34 ALR5th 57 (1995).
- Mary E. Taylor, Annotation, *Parent’s Use of Drugs as a Factor in Award of Custody of Children, Visitation Rights, or Termination of Parental Rights*, 20 ALR5th 534 (1994).
- Claudia G. Catalano, Annotation, *Child Custody and Visitation Rights of Person Infected with AIDS*, 86 ALR4th 211 (1991).
- 11 AM. JUR. TRIALS 347 *Child custody litigation* (1966).

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- *Representing Yourself in a Custody Case: A How to Do it Yourself Booklet*, Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut in collaboration with Connecticut Legal Services.
- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE: FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2000).
Chap. 40. Jurisdiction to Enter and Enforce Custody Orders

Chap. 41. Pendente Lite Custody & Visitation

Chap. 42. Child Custody and Visitation

(See especially § 42.2. Rights of Unmarried or Non-cohabiting Parents)

- FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT, Law Practice Handbooks, Inc. (1996).

Chap. 10. Child Custody and Visitation, by Jeffrey D. Ginzberg.

- CUSTODY DISPUTES: WHAT TO EXPECT FROM THE FAMILY RELATIONS OFFICE. Published by the Legal Assistance Resource Center of Connecticut (1994).

- SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (1985).

§ 10.05. Relative rights of mothers and fathers: nonmarital parents

§ 30.02. The putative father's standing to seek custody of his child

- MIMI E. LYSTER, CHILD CUSTODY: BUILDING PARENTING AGREEMENTS THAT WORK (1996). Chap. 11. Nontraditional Families

ARTICLES:

- Stephen J. Bahr et al., *Trends in Child Custody Awards: Has the Removal of Maternal Preference Made a Difference?* 28 FAM. L. Q. 247 (1994).

COMPILER:

Barbara J. Bradley, Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Norwich, One Courthouse Square, Norwich, CT 06360.
(860) 887-2398. EMAIL: barbara.bradley@jud.state.ct.us.

§ 1.5 Child Visitation Action

2002 EDITION

SCOPE: Bibliographic resources relating to actions seeking court ordered visitation when parents are unmarried.

STATUTES: CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)

- § 45a-604. Definitions
- § 45a-606. Father and mother joint guardians
- § 46b-54. Counsel for minor children. Duties.
- § 46b-56. Superior Court orders re custody and care of minor children ...
- § 46b-57. Third party intervention re custody of minor children. Preference of the child
- § 46b-59a. Mediation of disputes re enforcement of visitation rights
- § 46b-61. Orders re Children where parents live separately
- § 46b-64. Orders of court prior to return day of complaint
- §§ 46b-115—46b-115gg. *Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction & Enforcement Act*

COURT RULES [Connecticut Practice Book \(2002 ed.\)](#)

- Chapter 25. *Superior Court - Procedure in Family Matters*
 - § 25-4. Action for Visitation of Minor Child
 - § 25-5. Automatic Orders Upon Service of Complaint
 - § 25-9. Answer, Cross Complaint, Claims for Relief by Defendant
 - § 25-23. Motions, Requests, Orders of Notice, and Short Calendar
 - § 25-24. Motions
 - § 25-26. Modification of Custody, Alimony or Support
 - § 25-27. Motion for Contempt
 - § 25-28. Order of Notice
 - § 25-30. Statements to be Filed
 - § 25-38. Judgment Files
 - § 25-50. Case Management
 - § 25-57. Affidavit Concerning Children
 - § 25-59. Closed Hearings and Records
 - § 25-60 & §25-61. Family Division Evaluations and Studies
 - § 25-62. Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

- Public Acts 1974, No. 74-169, § 12, 17 H.R. Proc., Pt. 6, 1974 Sess., p. 2805 [§ 46b-61]
“...expands the jurisdiction of the superior court involving minor children and further states that the section can be used in controversies not only involving a husband and wife but in controversies involving parents of minor children or children if they are no longer married or were never married.”

FORMS: [Official Forms](#)

- JD-CL-12. Appearance
- JD-FM-75. Application for Waiver of Fees
- JD-FM-161. Custody / Visitation Application
- JD-FM-162. Order to Attend Hearing and Notice to the Defendant
- JD-FM-158. Notice of Automatic Orders

- JD-FM-164. Affidavit Concerning Children
- JD-FM-164A. Addendum to Affidavit Concerning Children
- JD-FM-167. Motion for Notice by Publication or Mail in Family Cases
- JD-FM-168. Order of Notice by Publication or Mail in Family Cases
- JD-FM-176. Motion for Orders Before Judgment (Pendente Lite)
- JD-FM-6. Financial Affidavit
- JD-FM-173. Motion for Contempt
- JD-FM-174. Motion for Modification
- JD-FM-183. Custody/Visitation Agreement
- JD-FM-185. Motion for Intervention in Family Matters

Unofficial Forms

- Temporary or Pendente Lite Orders
BARBARA KAHN STARK ET AL., FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDEBOOK FOR CONNECTICUT 370 (1998).
MARY ELLEN WYNN & ELLEN B. LUBELL, HANDBOOK OF FORMS FOR THE CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAWYER 97 (1991).
- Modification of Automatic Orders
BARBARA KAHN STARK ET AL., FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDEBOOK FOR CONNECTICUT 369 (1998).
- Visitation Schedule
FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT, Law Practice Handbooks, Inc. 10-62 (1996).
“Sample Visitation Order”, p. 10-62.

CASES:

- Laspina-Williams v. Laspina-Williams, 46 Conn. Supp. 165, 171, 742 A.2d 840 (1999). *Petition for visitation rights with the biological child of the defendant; the child was conceived through alternative insemination and had been jointly raised by the plaintiff and defendant who were same-sex partners.* “... the defendant allowed, even encouraged, the plaintiff to assume a significant role in the life of the child such that she is a party entitled to seek visitation with the child.”
- Temple v. Meyer, 208 Conn. 404, 544 A.2d 629 (1988).
- Ridgeway v. Ridgeway, 180 Conn. 533, 541, 429 A.2d 801 (1980). “In this case, the evidence showed ... that the plaintiff’s psychological instability was such that it posed a threat to the children’s well-being.” *Visitation limited to one day per week*
- Raymond v. Raymond, 165 Conn. 735, 742, 345 A.2d 48 (1974). “It has never been our law that support payments were conditioned on the ability to exercise rights of visitation or vice versa. The duty to support is wholly independent of the right of visitation.”

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- *Child Custody* # 175-231
- *Children out of Wedlock* # 20.9
- *Infants* # 19.3(4)

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- BARBARA KAHN STARK ET AL., FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDEBOOK FOR CONNECTICUT Ch. 7 (1998).
- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE: FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS §§ 41.1—41.46, 42.40—42.45 (2000).
- FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT, Law Practice Handbooks, Inc. §§ 10.37—10.39(1996).
- 3 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND

PRACTICE §§ 16.01—16.14 (2000).

- DONALD T. KRAMER, *LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN* §§ 3.01—3.15 (2d ed. 1994).

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 59 AM. JUR. 2D *Parent & child* § 36 (1987).
- Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, *Child Custody and Visitation Rights Arising From Same-Sex Relationship*, 80 ALR5th 1 (2000).
- Harriet Dinagar Milks, Annotation, *Smoking as Factor in Child Custody and Visitation Cases*, 36 ALR5th 377 (1996).
- Mary E. Taylor, Annotation, *Parent's Use of Drugs as a Factor in Award of Custody of Children, Visitation Rights, or Termination of Parental Rights*, 20 ALR5th 534 (1994).
- Claudia G. Catalano, Annotation, *Child Custody and Visitation Rights of Person Infected with AIDS*, 86 ALR4th 211 (1991).

COMPILER:

Barbara J. Bradley, Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Norwich, One Courthouse Square, Norwich, CT 06360.
(860) 887-2398. EMAIL: barbara.bradley@jud.state.ct.us.

§ 1.6 Parent as Guardian

2002 EDITION

SCOPE:

- Bibliographic resources relating to parents as guardians of minors in Connecticut

SEE ALSO:

- [Guardianship in Connecticut](#)

DEFINITION:

- **Mother:** “means (A) a woman who can show proof by means of a birth certificate or other sufficient evidence of having given birth to a child and (B) an adoptive mother as shown by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction or otherwise” CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-604 (2001).
- **Father:** “means a man who is a father under the law of this state including a man who, in accordance with section 46b-172, executes a binding acknowledgment of paternity and a man determined to be a father under chapter 815y;” CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-604(2) (2001) as amended by 2000 Conn. Acts 5 (Reg. Sess.).
- **Parent:** “means a mother as defined in subdivision (1) of this section or a ‘father’ as defined in subdivision (2) of this section” CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-604(3) (2001).
- **Presumption re best interest of the child to be in custody of parent:** “In any dispute as to the custody of a minor child involving a parent and a nonparent, there shall be a presumption that it is in the best interest of the child to be in the custody of the parent, which presumption may be rebutted by showing that it would be detrimental to the child to permit the parent to have custody.” CONN. GEN. STAT. §46b-56b (2001).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - Chapter 802h. Protected persons and their property
 - Part II. Guardians of the person of a minor
 - § 45a-605. Provisions construed in best interest of minor child
 - § 45a-606. Father and mother joint guardians
 - § 45a-609. Application for removal of parent as guardian.
 - Notice. Examination
 - § 45a-610. Removal of parent as guardian [as amended by 2001 CONN. ACTS 195 § 28 (Reg. Sess.)]
 - § 45a-611. Reinstatement of parent as guardian of the person of minor.
 - § 45a-612. Visitation rights of parent removed as guardian.
 - § 45a-623. Transfer of contested proceeding to Superior Court
 - § 45a-624a. Consent of parent required for designation of standby guardian.
 - Chapter 815j. Dissolution of marriage, legal separation and annulment
 - § 46b-56b. Presumption re best interest of child to be in custody of parent

LEGISLATIVE:

- 2001 CONN. ACTS 195 § 28 (Reg. Sess.), effective July 11, 2001, An act concerning the revisor's corrections to the General Statutes and certain Public Acts.
- 2000 Conn. Acts 75 (Reg. Sess.), effective October 1, 2000. An act concerning protection of children in Probate Courts. Substitute House Bill No. 5716.

- 1979 Conn. Acts 460 § 4 (Reg. Sess.). An act concerning guardianship of children.

FORMS:

- Probate Court
 - PC-500. Application/Removal of guardian
 - PC-520. Order of notice, temporary custody or removal and appointment of guardian
 - PC-530. Notice/Receipt of application for removal of guardian
 - PC-560. Decree/Removal of guardian and appointment

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- *Guardian and Ward*
 - # 4. Guardians by nature
 - # 25. Removal of guardian
 - # 26. Death of guardian

DIGESTS:

- DOWLING'S DIGEST: *Guardian and Ward*
§ 1. In general; Appointment
- CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Guardian*

COURT CASES

- Doe v. Doe, 244 Conn. 403, 455, 710 A.2d 1297 (1998). "As these authorities make clear, the presumption does not mean that the nonparent must, in order to rebut it, prove that the parent is unfit. It means that the parent has an initial advantage, and that the nonparent must prove facts sufficient to put into issue the presumed fact that it is in the child's best interest to be in the parent's custody. Once those facts are established, however, the presumption disappears, and the sole touchstone of the child's best interests remains irrespective of the parental or third party status of the adults involved. In that instance, then, neither adult - the parent or the third party - enjoys any advantage or suffers any disadvantage as a result of his or her parental or third party status."
- Bristol v. Brundage, 24 Conn. App. 402, 405, 589 A.2d 1 (1991). This statute [§ 46b-56b] was enacted to counteract the holding of McGaffin v. Roberts [below] . . . which held that 45-43 (now 45a-606) did not create a presumption that a surviving parent is entitled to preference in a custody dispute."
- McGaffin v. Roberts, 193 Conn. 393, 407, 479 A.2d 176 (1984), *cert. denied*, 470 U.S. 1050, 105 S.Ct. 1747, 84 L.Ed. 2d 813 (U.S. 1985). "Thus the factor of parenthood is to be properly considered in the aggregate of all those circumstances that a trial court is entitled to consider in exercising its broad discretion in deciding what is in the best interests of a minor child."
- Posey v. Yandell, 26 Conn. Supp. 320, 323, 222 A.2d 747 (1966). "Upon the death of the mother, the plaintiff became the sole guardian of the child Carolyn. It follows that the plaintiff has a prior right to custody unless the circumstances are such that to give it to him would not be for the best interest of the child."
- Antedomenico v. Antedomenico, 142 Conn. 558, 562, 115 A.2d 659 (1955). "If one parent is in default of his parental obligations, he or she may be deprived of the right to have the care and custody of a minor child, and that right may be conferred upon the other The state is primarily interested in having the status of husband and wife, with joint guardianship of children, maintained. When it is disrupted, the state

must exercise its duties as *parens patriae* in the interests of the child.”

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 39 AM JUR 2d *Guardian and Ward* (1999).
 - § 5. Parents as joint guardians
 - § 6. Rights of father
 - § 7. Rights of mother
 - § 8. Rights of other relatives
 - § 9. Incidents of guardianship by nature
 - § 10. Transfer of guardianship or custody of child
- 39 C.J.S. *Guardian and Ward* (1976).
 - § 6. Classes or kinds of guardians. Natural guardians

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- RALPH H. FOLSOM & GAYLE B. WILHELM, *INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN CONNECTICUT* 3D (2001).
 - Chapter 3. Guardianship
 - § 3.2. Guardianship of minors. Parent and child—statutory guardians of the person, custody and control, termination of parental rights, statutory parent
 - § 3:3. —Right to services and earnings, effects of emancipation
 - § 3:4. —Duty to support
 - § 3:10. Removal of parents or other guardians of minor’s person, temporary custody orders, visitation and reinstatement rights, appointment of guardian or co-guardian
- 1 DONALD T. KRAMER, *LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN* (2D ed. 1994).
 - Chapter 2. Child custody
 - § 2.15. Preference of the natural parent(s) over others; generally
- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., *CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS* (2000).
 - Chapter 42. Child Custody and Visitation
 - § 42.1. Parental custody rights—generally
 - § 42.2. Right of unmarried or non-cohabiting parents
 - § 44.19. Death of custodial parent
- PETER L. COSTAS, MANAGING ED., *LAWYERS’ DESKBOOK: A REFERENCE MANUAL*, (2d ed. 2000).
 - Lynn B. Cochrane, *Child Protection*. "Basic Principles: Guardianship of the Person of the Minor in Probate Court," pp. XVII-26, 28-30.

WEB SITES:

<http://www.jud.state.ct.us/probate/faq.html#GUARDIANSHIPS>

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.7 Termination of Parental Rights (TPR)

- “The fundamental liberty interest of natural parents in the care, custody, and management of their children does not evaporate simply because they have not been model parents or have lost temporary custody of their child to the State. Even when blood relationships are strained, parents retain a vital interest in preventing the irretrievable destruction of their family life. If anything, persons faced with forced dissolution of their parental rights have a more critical need for procedural protections than do those resisting state intervention in to ongoing family affairs.” Santorsky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745, 753, 102 S.Ct. 1388, 71 L.Ed 2d 599 (1982).
- “When the State moves to destroy weakened familial bonds, it must provide the parents with fundamentally fair procedures.” Santorsky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745, 753-754, 102 S.Ct. 1388, 71 L.Ed 2d 599 (1982).
- “[W]e recognize that ‘the right of parents qua parents to the custody of their children is an important principle that has constitutional dimensions,’ a principle echoed and illuminated in recent years by decisions of the United States Supreme Court and of this court.” In Re Juvenile Appeal (Docket No. 10155), 187 Conn. 431, 435, 446 A.2d 808 (1982).
- “Termination of parental rights is a judicial matter of exceptional gravity and sensitivity. Anonymous v. Norton, 168 Conn. 421, 430 362 A.2d 532 (1975). Termination of parental rights is the ultimate interference by the state in the parent-child relationship and, although such judicial action may be required under certain circumstances, the natural rights of the parents in their children ‘undeniably warrants deference and, absent a powerful countervailing interest, protection.’ Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, 651 92 S.Ct. 1208, 31 L.Ed.2d 551 (1972); In re Juvenile Appeal (Anonymous), 177 Conn. 648, 671 420 A.2d 875 (1979).” In Re Emmanuel M., 43 Conn. Sup. 108, 112, 648 A.2d 904 (1993)

§ 1.7a Rights of Parents in TPR

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the rights in general of parents and foster parents in termination of parental rights cases in Connecticut
- DEFINITIONS:**
- **Fourteenth Amendment** to the U.S. Constitution: “. . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”
 - **Due Process:** “freedom of personal choice in matters of . . . family life is one the liberties protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.” Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur, 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S. Ct. 791, 39 L. Ed. 2d 52 (1974).
 - **Equal protection of the laws:** “The guaranty of equal protection of the laws ensures that the laws apply alike to all in the same situation, or that similar treatment is afforded to those in similar circumstances.” In re Nicolina T., 9 Conn. App. 598, 606 (1987).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001).
 - Chapter 319a. Child welfare
 - § 17a-112. Termination of parental rights of child committed to commissioner.
 - Chapter 803. Termination of parental rights and adoption
 - § 45a-708. Guardian ad litem for minor or incompetent parent
 - § 45a-715. Petition to terminate parental rights
 - § 45a-716. **Hearing on petition to terminate parental rights. Notice**
 - (b) The court shall cause notice of the hearing to be given to the following persons as . . . (2) the father of any minor child born out of wedlock, provided at the time of filing the petition (A) he has been adjudicated the father of such child by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) he has acknowledged in writing to be the father of such child, or (C) he has contributed regularly to the support of such child, or (D) his name appears on the birth certificate, or (E) he has filed a claim for paternity as provided under section 46b-172s, or (F) he has been named in the petition as the father of the child by the mother . . . If the recipient of the notice is a person described in subdivision (1) or (2) or is any other person whose parental rights are sought to be terminated in the petition, the notice shall contain a statement that the respondent has the right to be represented by counsel and if the respondent is unable to pay for counsel, counsel will be appointed for the respondent.
 - § 45a-717. Termination of parental rights. Conduct of hearing, Investigation and report. Grounds for termination
 - (a) At the hearing held on any petition for the termination of parental rights . . . any party to whom notice was given shall have the right to appear and be heard with respect to the petition.
 - § 45a-719. Reopening judgment terminating parental rights.

Best interest of child. Final decree of adoption.

COURT RULES:

- CONN. PRACTICE BOOK (2002)
Chapter 34. Rights of parties.
 - § 34-1. Right to counsel and to remain silent
 - § 34-2. Hearing procedure; subpoenas
 - (b). Any indigent party may request subpoenas for persons to testify on the issues before the judicial authority
 - § 34-3. Standards of proof
 - § 34-4. Child witness

CASES:

- Roth v. Weston, 259 Conn. 202, 231, 789 A.2d 431 (2002). "We recognize that due process requires the clear and convincing test be applied to the termination of parental rights because it is the complete severance by court order of the legal relationship, with all its rights and responsibilities"
- Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, 651, 92 S.Ct. 1208, 31 L.Ed.2d 551 (1972). "The private interest here, that of a man in the children he has sired and raised, undeniably warrants deference and, absent a powerful countervailing interest, protection."
- Quilloin v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 646, 255, 98 S.Ct. 549, 54 L.Ed.2d 511 (1978). "But this is not a case in which the unwed father at any time had, or sought, actual or legal custody of his child. Nor is this a case in which the proposed adoption would place the child with a new set of parents with whom the child had never before lived. Rather, the result of the adoption in this case is to give full recognition to a family unit already in existence, a result desired by all except appellant."
- Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166, 64 S. Ct. 438, 88 L. Ed. 645 (1944). "It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder."
- In re Luke, 40 Conn. Supp. 316, 326-327, 498 A.2d 1054 (1985). "It is the responsibility of all of the adults involved to give the children's interest top priority over their own emotional objectives, so that they may understand and benefit from the fact that they have two 'Daddies' who love them, that having two 'Daddies' is not 'too complicated' but is rather an enriching factor in their lives."

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Constitutional law* # 274(5). Deprivation of personal rights in general. Privacy, marriage, family, and sexual matters
- *Infants* # 178. Evidence. Termination of parental rights

DIGESTS:

- *ALR DIGEST: Attorneys* § 35. Right to counsel and consultation
Termination of parental rights
- CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Termination of Parental Rights*
- US L ED DIGEST: Constitutional Law § 803.5

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 16B AM. JUR 2d *Constitutional Law* (1998).
 - § 955. Hearing. Character and sufficiency; in general—Presence of person; counsel
- 59 AM. JUR 2d *Parent and Child* (2002).
 - § 36. Loss or forfeiture of right
 - § 37. —Burden of proof
- Patricia C. Kussman, Annotation, *Right Of Indigent Parent To Appointed Counsel In Proceeding For Involuntary Termination Of Parental Rights*, 92 ALR5th 379 (2001).

- Wanda Ellen Wakefield, Annotation, *Validity Of State Statutes Providing For Termination Of Parental Rights*, 22 ALR4th 774 (1983).
- Joel E. Smith, Annotation, *Right of Indigent Parent to Appointed Counsel In Proceeding For Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights*, 80 ALR3d 1141 (1977)
- *Termination Of Parental Rights Based On Abuse Or Neglect*, 9 COA 2d 483 (1997).

§ 24. Presumption and burden of proof

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- RALPH H. FOLSOM AND GAYLE B. WILHELM, INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN CONNECTION 3d (2001).
Chapter 5. Adoption and Parental Rights
§ 5:6. Termination of parental rights and appointment of guardian or statutory parent for adoption petition
§ 5:7. Notice, guardian ad litem
§ 5:8. Hearing, investigation and report, grounds for termination of parental rights, consent termination
- 1 JOAN HEIFETZ HOLLINGER ET AL., ADOPTION LAW AND PRACTICE (2001).
Chapter 2. Consent to adoption
§ 2.10. Exceptions to the requirement of parental consent
§ 2.10[2]. State courts and statutory examples
- 4 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002).
Chapter 28. Termination of parental rights
§ 28.02. Elements of the proceeding
§ 28.02[2]. Constitutional limitations
§ 28.03. Procedural protections
[1]. Service of process
[2]. Notification of charges
[4]. Counsel for the parents
[5]. Disclosure
- ANN M. HARALAMBIE, HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES (1993).
Chapter 13. Termination of Parental Rights
§ 13.18. Unmarried fathers

LAW REVIEWS:

- Michael J. Keenan, Note, *Connecticut's Trend In The Termination Of Parental Rights And What Can Be Done To Further It*, 10 CONNECTICUT PROBATE LAW JOURNAL 269 (1996).
II. Background
E. The federal judiciary and constitutional issues, pp. 294-297

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 2 Rights of the remaining parent in TPR

Rights of the Remaining Parent in TPR	
CONN. GEN. STATS. § 17a-112(i) (2001) (partial)	“ Consent for the termination of the parental rights of one parent does not diminish the parental rights of the other parent of the child, nor does it relieve the other parent of the duty to support the child.”
CONN. GEN. STATS. § 17a-112(n) (2001) (partial)	“If the parental rights of only one parent are terminated, the remaining parent shall be the sole parent and, unless otherwise provided by law, guardian of the person.”
CONN. GEN. STATS. § 45a-717(i) (2001)	“If the parental rights of only one parent are terminated, the remaining parent shall be sole parent and, unless otherwise provided by law, guardian of the person.”

§ 1.7b Right to Counsel

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the right to counsel in termination of parental rights in Connecticut.
- DEFINITIONS:**
- “If a party appears without counsel, the court shall inform such party of the party’s right to counsel and upon request, if he or she is unable to pay for counsel, shall appoint counsel to represent such party. No party may waive counsel unless the court has first explained the nature and meaning of a petition for the termination of parental rights.” CONN. GEN. STAT. (1999) § 45a-717(b).
 - “The respondent’s due process rights are therefore properly determined by the balancing test of Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 334, 96 S.Ct. 893, 47 L.Ed.2d 18 (1976), employed by the United States Supreme Court in considering a parent’s right in termination proceedings to representation by counsel . . . ” In Re Juvenile Appeal (Docket No. 10155), 187 Conn. 431, 435, 446 A.2d 808 (1982).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - Chapter 319a. Child welfare
 - § 17a-112. Termination of parental rights of child committed to commissioner.
 - Chapter 803. Termination of parental rights and adoption
 - § 45a-715. Petition to terminate parental rights
 - § 45a-716. **Hearing on petition to terminate parental rights. Notice**
 - (b). . . . If the recipient of the notice is a person described in subdivision (1) or (2) or is any other person whose parental rights are sought to be terminated in the petition, the notice shall contain a statement that the respondent has the right to be represented by counsel and if the respondent is unable to pay for counsel, counsel will be appointed for the respondent.
 - § 45a-717. Termination of parental rights. Conduct of hearing, Investigation and report. Grounds for termination
 - § 45a-719. Reopening judgment terminating parental rights. Best interest of child. Final decree of adoption
- COURT RULES:**
- CONN. PRACTICE BOOK (2002)
 - Chapter 34. Rights of parties.
 - § 34-1. Right to counsel and to remain silent
- CASES:**
- In re Alexander V., 223 Conn. 557, 566, 613 A.2d 780 (1992). “Accordingly we conclude that due process does not require a competency hearing in all termination cases but only when (1) the parent’s attorney requests such a hearing, or (2) in the absence of such a request, the conduct of the parent reasonably suggests to the court, in the exercise of its discretion, the desirability of ordering such a hearing sua sponte.”
- WEST KEY**
- *Constitutional law* # 274(5). Deprivation of personal rights in general.

- NUMBERS:**
- Privacy, marriage, family, and sexual matters
 - *Infants* # 178. Evidence. Termination of parental rights
- DIGESTS:**
- *ALR DIGEST: Attorneys* § 35. Right to counsel and consultation
Termination of parental rights
 - CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Termination of Parental Rights*
 - US L ED DIGEST: Constitutional Law § 803.5
- ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**
- 16B AM. JUR 2d *Constitutional Law* (1998).
§ 955. Hearing. Character and sufficiency; in general—Presence of person; counsel
 - 59 AM. JUR 2d *Parent and Child* (2002).
§ 36. Loss or forfeiture of right
§ 37. —Burden of proof
 - Wanda Ellen Wakefield, Annotation, *Validity Of State Statutes Providing For Termination Of Parental Rights*, 22 ALR4th 774 (1983).
 - Joel E. Smith, Annotation, *Right of Indigent Parent to Appointed Counsel In Proceeding For Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights*, 80 ALR3d 1141 (1977).
 - *Termination Of Parental Rights Based On Abuse Or Neglect*, 9 COA 2d 483 (1997)
- TEXTS & TREATISES:**
- RALPH H. FOLSOM AND GAYLE B. WILHELM, INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN CONNECTION 3d (2001).
Chapter 5. Adoption and Parental Rights
§ 5:6. Termination of parental rights and appointment of guardian or statutory parent for adoption petition
§ 5:7. Notice, guardian ad litem
§ 5:8. Hearing, investigation and report, grounds for termination of parental rights, consent termination
 - 4 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002).
Chapter 28. Termination of parental rights
§ 28.03. Procedural protections
[4]. Counsel for the parents
 - ANN M. HARALAMBIE, HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES (1993).
Chapter 13. Termination of Parental Rights
§ 13.06. Right to counsel
- LAW REVIEWS:**
- Michael J. Keenan, Note, *Connecticut's Trend In The Termination Of Parental Rights And What Can Be Done To Further It*, 10 CONNECTICUT PROBATE LAW JOURNAL 269 (1996).
II. Background
E. The federal judiciary and constitutional issues, pp. 290-291
- COMPILER:**
- Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.7c Standard of Proof

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the standard of proof in termination of parental rights in Connecticut.
- DEFINITIONS:**
- “The constitutional guarantee of due process of law requires that the statutory grounds for termination of parental rights be established by ‘clear and convincing evidence,’ not merely a fair preponderance of the evidence.” In Re Emmanuel, 43 Conn. Supp. 108, 113, 648 A.2d 904 (1994).
 - “The respondent’s due process rights are therefore properly determined by the balancing test of *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 334, 96 S.Ct. 893, 47 L.Ed.2d 18 (1976), employed by the United States Supreme Court in considering a parent’s right in termination proceedings to representation by counsel . . . and to the use of a clear and convincing standard of proof” In Re Juvenile Appeal (Docket No. 10155), 187 Conn. 431, 435, 446 A.2d 808 (1982).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 17a-112. *Termination of parental rights of child committed to commissioner*
- COURT RULES:**
- CONN. PRACTICE BOOK (2001)
Chapter 34. Rights of parties.
§ 34-3. Standards of proof
- CASES:**
- In The Interests of Jaisean M., 2002 Ct. Sup. 5787, 5789, 2002 WL 1156030 (May 3, 2002) “*Roth and Troxel* have nothing to do with a termination of parental rights case. In fact, the burden of proof in a termination of parental rights case has long been ‘clear and convincing evidence,’ and the requirement that a grandparent seeking visitation overcome a similar burden actually parallels and reaffirms, rather than undermines, the statutory scheme applicable to termination cases.”
 - In re Eden, 250 Conn. 674, 694, 741 A.2d 873 (1999). “The constitutional requirement of proof by clear and convincing evidence applies only to those findings upon which the ultimate decision to terminate parental rights is predicated.”
- WEST KEY NUMBERS:**
- *Constitutional law* # 274(5). Deprivation of personal rights in general. Privacy, marriage, family, and sexual matters
 - *Infants* # 178. Evidence. Termination of parental rights
- DIGESTS:**
- *ALR DIGEST*: Attorneys § 35. Right to counsel and consultation
Termination of parental rights
 - CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Termination of Parental Rights*
 - US L ED DIGEST: Constitutional Law § 803.5
- ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**
- 16B AM. JUR 2d *Constitutional Law* (1998).
§ 955. Hearing. Character and sufficiency; in general—Presence of person; counsel

- 59 AM. JUR 2d *Parent and Child* (2002).
§ 36. Loss or forfeiture of right
§ 37. —Burden of proof
- Wanda Ellen Wakefield, Annotation, *Validity Of State Statutes Providing For Termination Of Parental Rights*, 22 ALR4th 774 (1983).
- Joel E. Smith, Annotation, *Right of Indigent Parent to Appointed Counsel In Proceeding For Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights*, 80 ALR3d 1141 (1977).
- *Termination Of Parental Rights Based On Abuse Or Neglect*, 9 COA 2d 483 (1997).
§ 24. Presumption and burden of proof

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- ANN M. HARALAMBIE, *HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES* (1993).
Chapter 13. Termination of Parental Rights
§ 13.03. Standard of proof
- 4 JOAN HEIFETZ HOLLINGER ET AL., *ADOPTION LAW AND PRACTICE* (2001).
§ 2.10. Exceptions to the requirement of parental consent
[2]. State courts and statutory examples
- SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, *CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE* (1999).
Chapter 28. Termination of parental rights
§ 28.04[2]. Burden of proof

LAW REVIEWS:

- Michael J. Keenan, Note, *Connecticut's Trend In The Termination Of Parental Rights And What Can Be Done To Further It*, 10 CONNECTICUT PROBATE LAW JOURNAL 269 (1996).
II. Background
E. The federal judiciary and constitutional issues, pp. 293-294

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL:
Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.7d Equal Protection of the Laws

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws in termination of parental rights in Connecticut
- DEFINITIONS:**
- “The guaranty of equal protection of the laws ensures that the laws apply alike to all in the same situation, or that similar treatment is afforded to those in similar circumstances.” In re Nicolina T., 9 Conn. App. 598, 606, 520 A.2d 639 (1987).
- CASES:**
- In re Nicolina T., 9 Conn. App. 598, 606, 520 A.2d 639 (1987). “The trial court’s court decision to terminate the respondent’s parental rights was made pursuant to the statutory requirements of General Statutes § 17-43a (b) [now § 17a-112], makes no distinction between mentally ill and other persons. As such, the statutory criteria applies with equal force to all parents without regard to their mental condition.”
- WEST KEY NUMBERS:**
- Constitutional Law #225.1. Equal protection of the laws. Regulations affecting civil rights or personal rights and relations in general.
- DIGESTS:**
- ALR DIGEST: *Termination of parental rights*
 - CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Termination of Parental Rights*
- ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**
- Wanda Ellen Wakefield, Annotation, *Validity Of State Statutes Providing For Termination Of Parental Rights*, 22 ALR4th 774 (1983).
§§ 5-9. Objections on grounds of discrimination; Equal protection
- COMPILER:** Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.7e Notice and Opportunity To Be Heard

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the constitutional guarantee of notice and the opportunity to be heard including determination of parental competency.
- DEFINITIONS:**
- **Mentally incompetent person:** “one who is unable to understand the nature of the termination proceeding and unable to assist in the presentation of his or her case.” In re Alexander V., 223 Conn. 557, 563, 613 A.2d 780 (1992).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 45a-716. **Hearing on petition to terminate parental rights. Notice**
 - (a) Upon receipt of a petition for termination of parental rights, the Court of Probate or the Superior Court . . . shall set a time and place for hearing the petition. The time for hearing shall be not more than thirty days after the filing of the petition.
 - (b) The court shall cause notice of the hearing to be given to the following persons as applicable: (1) The parent or parents of the minor child, including any parent who has been removed as guardian on or after October 1, 1973, under section 45a-606; (2) the father of any minor child born out of wedlock, provided at the time of filing the petition (A) he has been adjudicated the father of such child by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) he has acknowledged in writing to be the father of such child, or (C) he has contributed regularly to the support of such child, or (D) his name appears on the birth certificate, or (E) he has filed a claim for paternity as provided under section 46b-172s, or (F) he has been named in the petition as the father of the child by the mother; (3) the guardian or any other person whom the courts shall deem appropriate
 - (c) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, notice of the hearing and a copy of the petition, certified by the petitioner, the petitioner's agent or attorney, or the court clerk, shall be served at least ten days before the date for the hearing by personal service on the persons enumerated in subsection (b) of this section who are within the state, and by certified mail, return receipt requested, on the Commissioner of Children and Families. If the address of any person entitled to personal service is unknown, or if personal service cannot be reasonably effected within the state or if any person enumerated in subsection (b) of this section is out of the state, a judge or clerk of the court shall order notice to be given by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, or by publication at least ten days before the date of the hearing. Any publication shall be in a newspaper of general circulation in the place of the last-known address of the person to be notified, whether within or without this state, or if no such address is known, in the place where the termination petition has been filed.
 - (d) In any proceeding pending in the Court of Probate, in lieu of

personal service on a parent or the father of a child born out of wedlock who is either a petitioner or who signs under oath a written waiver of personal service on a form provided by the Probate Court Administrator, the court may order notice to be given by certified mail, return receipt requested, deliverable to addressee only and at least ten days prior to the date of the hearing. If such delivery cannot reasonably be effected, or if the whereabouts of the parents is unknown, then notice shall be ordered to be given by publication, as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

§ 45a-717. **Termination of parental rights. Conduct of hearing, Investigation and report. Grounds for termination**

(a) At the hearing held on any petition for the termination of parental rights . . . any party to whom notice was given shall have the right to appear and be heard with respect to the petition.

CASES:

- In re Alexander V., 223 Conn. 557, 566, 613 A.2d 780 (1992). “Accordingly we conclude that due process does not require a competency hearing in all termination cases but only when (1) the parent’s attorney requests such a hearing, or (2) in the absence of such a request, the conduct of the parent reasonably suggests to the court, in the exercise of its discretion, the desirability of ordering such a hearing sua sponte.”

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- CONSTITUTIONAL LAW # 274. Deprivation of personal rights in general. Privacy
(5). Privacy; marriage, family and sexual matters
- MENTAL HEALTH # 472. Capacity to sue and be sued

DIGESTS:

- CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Termination of Parental Rights*

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- ANN M. HARALAMBIE, *HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES* (1993).
Chapter 13. Termination of Parental Rights
§ 13.04. Standing
§ 13.05. Service of process
- 1 JOAN HEIFETZ HOLLINGER ET AL., *ADOPTION LAW AND PRACTICE* (2001).
§ 2.10[2]. State courts and statutory examples
- 4 SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, *CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE* (2002).
Chapter 28. Termination of parental rights
§ 28.03. Procedural protections
[1]. Service of process
[2]. Notification of charges
§ 28.04[5]. Right to be physically present

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Department Law Library, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 1.8 Adoption of Child

2002 EDITION

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic resources relating to adoption by relative in Connecticut including unmarried father and the child's grandparents
- DEFINITION:**
- **Relative:** "means any person descended from a common ancestor, whether by blood or adoption, not more than three generations removed from the child" CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-707(6) (2001).
 - **Relative:** "shall include, but not be limited to, a person who has been adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be the father of a child born out of wedlock, or who has acknowledged his paternity under the provisions of section 46b-172a, with further relationship to the child determined through the father." CONN. GEN. STAT. § 45a-724(a)(4) (2001).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
 - § 45a-724 (a)(3) and (b). Who may give child in adoption
 - § 45a-725. When child free for adoption
 - § 45a-727. Application and agreement of adoption. Investigation, report, assessment of fees. Hearings and decrees.
- LEGISLATIVE:**
- LAWRENCE K. FURBISH, BACKGROUND ON ADOPTION, Connecticut General Assembly, Office of Legislative Research Report 94-R-703 (December 5, 1994).
URL: <http://www.cga.state.ct.us/ps98/rpt/olr/98%2Dr%2D0285.doc>
- FORMS:**
- Probate Court Forms
 - PC-603. Application/Adoption
 - PC-610. Affidavit/ Temporary Custody, Removal, Termination or Adoption
 - PC-681. Agreement of Adoption
 - PC-663. Decree/Adoption
 - PC-650. Adoption/Certificate
- CASES:**
- Mullins v. Oregon, 57 F.3d 789 (9th Circuit 1995). *Constitutional rights of grandparents.*
 - Lehr v. Robertson, 463 U.S. 248, 77 Led 2d 614 (1983). *Unwed father*
- DIGESTS:**
- WEST KEY NUMBER: *Adoption*
 - DOWLING'S DIGEST *Adoption*
 - CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS *Adoption*
- ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**
- 2 AM. JUR. 2D *Adoption* (1994).
 - § 17. Persons who may adopt. Other blood relatives
 - § 22. Persons who may be adopted. Blood relatives; natural children
 - 2 C.J.S. *Adoption of Persons* (1972).
 - §§ 13-17. Persons who may adopt
 - §§ 18-24. Persons who may be adopted
- TEXTS & TREATISES:**
- RALPH H. FOLSOM & GAYLE B. WILHELM, INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN CONNECTICUT 3d (2001).
Chapter 5. Adoption and parental rights

§ 5.4. Who may give minors in adoption

- Dianne E. Yamin, Hon., *Adoption: Law and Practice, in* CONNECTICUT LAWYERS' DESKBOOK: A REFERENCE MANUAL, XVIII-1 to XVIII-16 (Peter L. Costas, managing ed., 1998).
“Relative adoption,” p. XVIII-8
- 6 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN, GEN. ED., FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE (2001).
Chapter 64. Adoption law, procedure and practice
§ 64.07. Who may adopt
§ 64.08. Who may be adopted
- 1 THOMAS A. JACOBS, CHILDREN AND THE LAW: RIGHTS & OBLIGATIONS (1995).
Chapter 4. Adoption
§ 4:08. Who may adopt
- ANN M. HARALAMBIE, HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES (2d Ed. 1993).
Chapter 14. Adoption
§ 14.06. Unmarried fathers
§ 14.07. Unnamed fathers
§ 14.09. Rights of grandparents

LAW REVIEWS:

- Richard Hoffman, Note, *Grudging And Crabbed Approach To Due Process For The Unwed Father*, 16 CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW 571 (1984).
- Deborah L. Forman, *Unwed Fathers and Adoption: A Theoretical Analysis in Context*, 72 TEXAS LAW REVIEW 967 (1994). [Available at the Law Library at Norwich]

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

2

Cohabitation in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

Definition:

- “Cohabitation is a dwelling together of man and woman in the same place in the manner of husband and wife.” Wolk v. Wolk, 191 Conn. 328, 332, 464 A.2d 780 (1983).
- “As is readily apparent, the word is not inflexible nor is it one of strict or narrow meaning.” DeMaria v. DeMaria, 247 Conn. 715, 720, 724 A.2d 1088 (1999).

Sections in this chapter:

§ 1 COHABITATION WITHOUT MARRIAGE	43
§ 2 DURING DIVORCE.....	48
§ 3 FOLLOWING DIVORCE	52

Tables in this Chapter

Table 3 Unreported Connecticut decisions on cohabitation without marriage.....	45
Table 4 ALR annotations on cohabitation without marriage	46
Table 5 ALR annotations on cohabitation during divorce	49
Table 6 Unreported Connecticut decisions on adultery during divorce.....	50
Table 7 ALR annotation on cohabitation following divorce.....	55
Table 8 Unpublished Connecticut Decisions: Cohabitation following divorce.....	58

Figures in this Chapter

Figure 1 Motion for modification and/or termination of periodic alimony.....	56
--	----

See also:

Chapter 3. Cohabitation agreements in Connecticut

Index

Cohabitation

Adultery	Living together vs. cohabitation, § 2.3
during divorce, § 2.2 and Table 5, 6	Modification of alimony, cohabitation effect on, § 2.3
following divorce, § 2.3 and Table 7	Motion for Modification and/or Termination of Periodic Alimony, Figure 1
Affirmative defense in criminal sexual offenses, § 2.1	Parents, unmarried cohabiting or non-cohabiting, § 2.1
Alimony, effect of cohabitation on	Privileged communication, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
during divorce, § 2.2 and Table 5	Remarriage vs. cohabitation, § 2.1
following divorce, § 2.3 and Table 7	Resumption of cohabitation following divorce, § 2.3
ALR annotations	Termination of cohabitation agreements, § 2.1
cohabitation during divorce, Table 5	Tort, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
cohabitation following divorce, Table 7	Unmarried cohabitation , § 2.1
cohabitation without marriage, Table 4	Unmarried cohabitation, agreements, § 2.1
Automobile insurance, unmarried, Table 4	Unmarried cohabitation, Child custody, § 2.1 and Table 4
Child custody and visitation, effect of cohabitation on	Unmarried cohabitation, Child visitation, § 2.1 and Table 4
during divorce, § 2.2 and Table 5	Unmarried cohabitation, contracts, § 2.1 and Table 4
following divorce, § 2.3 and Table 7	Unmarried cohabitation, property rights, § 2.1 and Table 4
Cohabitation, definition, Title page (Chapter 2)	Unmarried cohabitation, unreported cases, Table 3
Common law marriage, § 2.1	Wills, unmarried cohabitants, § 2.1
Dating after filing for divorce, § 2.2 and Table 6	Zoning, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
Domestic violence, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4	
Enforcement of cohabitation agreements, § 2.1	
Estate planning, unmarried cohabitants, § 2.1	
Home purchase, unmarried, § 2.1	
Housing, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4	
Inheritance, Table 5	
Living together contracts, § 2.1	

Texts & Treatises

ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000), §§ 2.1-2.3

FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT (1996), § 2.3

GRAHAM DOUTHWAITE. UNMARRIED COUPLES AND THE LAW (1979), § 2.1

RALPH WARNER ET AL. THE LIVING TOGETHER KIT: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000), § 2.1

SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984), § 2.1

For the holdings of individual libraries see <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/lawlib/searchcat.htm>

§ 2.1 Cohabitation Without Marriage

2002 EDITION

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic resources relating to the legal effect of cohabitation on persons not married—including contracts and agreements between them, child custody and visitation, and property rights.
- SEE ALSO:**
- Chapter 3. Cohabitation Agreements in Connecticut
- DEFINITIONS:**
- “We agree with the trial referee that cohabitation alone does not create any contractual relationship or, unlike marriage, impose other legal duties upon the parties. In this jurisdiction, common law marriages are not accorded validity The rights and obligations that attend a valid marriage simply do not arise where the parties choose to cohabit outside the marital relationship Ordinary contract principles are not suspended, however, for unmarried persons living together, whether or not they engage in sexual activity.”
Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 339, 521 A.2d 142 (1987).
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 53a-67(b). Cohabitation as affirmative defense in certain criminal sexual offenses.
- COURT CASES:**
- Herring v. Daniels, 70 Conn. App. 649, 656 (2002). “Rather, where the parties have established an unmarried, cohabiting relationship, it is the specific conduct of the parties within that relationship that determines their respective rights and obligations, including the treatment of their individual property Any such finding must be determined by reference to the unique circumstances and arrangements between the parties present in each case. Those matters are questions of fact that are within the singular province of the trial court, and can only be determined by evaluating the credibility of the witnesses and weighing conflicting evidence.”
 - Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 339, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). “Ordinary contract principles are not suspended, however, for unmarried persons living together, whether or not they engage in sexual activity.”
 - Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 381, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987). “Thus, a contract, express or implied, or some other tacit understanding between the parties who are not married to one another which does not rely upon their sexual behavior is enforceable in the courts of this state.”
 - Gallo v. Gallo, 184 Conn. 36, 45, 440 A.2d 782 (1981). “The testimony before the trial court concerned only the woman with whom the defendant was cohabiting at the time of the hearing. Thus there is no basis in the evidence for the trial court to extend the restriction to any other woman. The judgment must be modified so that the overnight visitation restriction applies only to the particular woman who was living with the defendant at the time of the hearing.”
- COURT CASES:**
(Other states)
- Marvin v. Marvin, 557 P.2d 106 (1976). California.
 - Beal v. Beal, 577 P.2d 507 (1978). Oregon.
- DIGESTS:**
- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: Cohabitation

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
Chapter 42. Child Custody and Visitation
§ 42.2 Rights of unmarried or non-cohabiting parents
- 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried cohabitants
§ 47.1 In general
§ 47.3 Validity
§ 47.6 Separate property
§ 47.7 Joint purchases and contracts
§ 47.8 Enforcement of cohabitation agreements
§ 47.9 Termination of living together arrangements
- SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984).
Chapter 3. Cohabitation
- RALPH WARNER ET AL. THE LIVING TOGETHER KIT: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000).
Chapter 4. Living together contracts
Chapter 6. Buying a house together
Chapter 7. Starting a family
Chapter 9. Moving on—when unmarried couples separate
Chapter 10. Wills and estate planning
- GRAHAM DOUTHWAITE. UNMARRIED COUPLES AND THE LAW (1979).
Chapter 2. Ramifications of the unmarried status
Chapter 3. Status of children of relationship
Chapter 4. Rights to accumulated property and value of services rendered during cohabitation
Chapter 6. State-by-state commentary
§ 6.7. "Connecticut"

PERIODICALS

- Dianne S. Burden, *Remarriage Vs. Cohabitation: Tradition Doesn't Always Make Sense*, 12 CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW JOURNAL 4 (1993).
- Rebecca Melton Rosubsky, *Legal Rights Of Unmarried Heterosexual And Homosexual Couples*, 10 CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW JOURNAL 8 (1991).
- Edith F. McClure, *Marvin Revisited: A Comment On Boland V. Catalano*, 5 CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW JOURNAL 51 (1987).

ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- 46 AM. JUR. 2d *Joint Ventures* (1994).
§ 58. Effect of marital relationship or unmarried cohabitation.
- 59A AM. JUR. 2d *Partnerships* (1987).
§ 243. Unmarried cohabitants of opposite sex as partners
- see [Table 1: ALR Annotations on Cohabitation without marriage](#)
- *Child Custody And Visitation Rights As Affected By Sexual Lifestyle Of Parents*, 3 PREPARATION FOR SETTLEMENT AND TRIAL 659 (1986).
- *Cause Of Action By Unmarried Cohabitant To Enforce Agreement Or Understanding Regarding Support Or Division Of Property*, 8 COA 2d 1 (1995).

COMPILER

Compiled by Lawrence Cheeseman, Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT

Table 3 Unreported Connecticut decisions on cohabitation without marriage

<h2 style="text-align: center;">Unreported Connecticut Decisions: Cohabitation without Marriage</h2>	
<p><u>Champoux v. Porter</u>, No. CV 98 0057585 S (Dec. 2, 1998), 23 Conn. L. Repr. No. 6,219 (January 4, 1999), 1998 Ct. Sup. 14572, 1998 WL 867270 (Conn. Super. 1998).</p>	<p>In the present case, the court finds that no agreement or understanding existed between the parties that each would accrue individual credit for each contribution made to buy and keep the home to be applied to the proceeds resulting from a future sale. Every sum used for these purposes was a gift to the other as a joint owner so that any disparity in amount contributed is immaterial.</p>
<p><u>Vibert v. Atchley</u>, No. CV93-0346622 (May 23, 1996), 16 Conn. L. Repr. No. 19, 604 (July 8, 1996), 1996 Ct. Sup. 4332-JJJJ Page 4125, 1996 WL 364777 (Conn. Super. 1996).</p>	<p>Accordingly, because Connecticut does not recognize common law marriage and cohabitation alone does not create any contractual relationship or give rise to any other rights and obligations that attend to a valid marriage, such as the continuing duty to support upon which an award of alimony is primarily based, no right to palimony exists under Connecticut law.</p> <p>Nevertheless, "[o]rdinary contract principles are not suspended . . . for unmarried persons living together, whether or not they engage in sexual activity. Contracts expressly providing for the performance of sexual acts, of course, have been characterized as meretricious and held unenforceable as violative of public policy." <u>Boland v. Catalano</u>, supra, 202 Conn. [333,]339. "[T]he courts should enforce express contracts between nonmarital partners except to the extent that the contract is explicitly founded on the consideration of meretricious sexual services. . . . In the absence of an express contract, the courts should inquire into the conduct of the parties to determine whether that conduct demonstrates an implied contract, agreement of partnership or joint venture, or some other tacit understanding between the parties. The courts may also employ the doctrine of quantum meruit, or equitable remedies such as constructive or resulting trusts, when warranted by the facts of the case." <u>Boland v. Catalano</u>, supra, 202 Conn. 340-41, quoting <u>Marvin v. Marvin</u>, 18 Cal.3d 660, 665, 557 P.2d 106, 134 Cal. Rptr. 815 (1976). "Thus, a contract, express or implied, or some other tacit understanding between persons who are not married to one another which does not rely upon their sexual behavior is enforceable in the courts of this state." <u>Burns v. Koellmer</u>, 11 Conn. App. 375, 381, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987).</p> <p>Based on the foregoing, the plaintiff and the defendant entered into an enforceable contract when the defendant signed their June 13, 1991 agreement.</p>

Table 4 ALR annotations on cohabitation without marriage

<h2 style="text-align: center;">ALR Annotations:</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Cohabitation without Marriage</h3>		
Subject	Title of Annotation	Citation
Automobile Insurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annotation, <i>Who Is A "Spouse" Within Clause Of Automobile Liability, Uninsured Motorist, Or No-Fault Insurance Policy Defining Additional Insured</i> 	36 ALR4th 588 (1985)
Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alan Stephens, Annotation, <i>Parental Rights Of Man Who Is Not Biological Or Adoptive Father Of Child But Was Husband Or Cohabitant Or Mother When Child Was Conceived Or Born</i> 	84 ALR4th 655 (1991)
Contracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jean E. Maess, Annotation, <i>Order Awarding Temporary Support Or Living Expenses Upon Separation Of Unmarried Partners Pending Contract Action Based Upon Services Relating To Personal Relationship</i> Jane Massey Draper, Annotation, <i>Recovery For Services Rendered By Persons Living In Apparent Relation Of Husband And Wife Without Express Agreement For Compensation</i> 	35 ALR4th 409 (1985) 94 ALR3d 552 (1979)
Domestic Violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elizabeth Trainor, Annotation, <i>"Cohabitation" For Purposes Of Domestic Violence Statutes</i> 	71 ALR5th 285 (1999)
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caroll J. Miller, Annotation, <i>What Constitutes Illegal Discrimination Under State Statutory Prohibition Against Discrimination In Housing Accommodations On Account Of Marital Status</i> 	33 ALR4th 964 (1984)
Privileged communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annotation, <i>Communication Between Unmarried Couple Living Together As Privileged</i> 	4 ALR4th 422 (1981)
Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> George L. Blum, Annotation, <i>Property Rights Arising From Relationship Of Couple Cohabiting Without Marriage</i> Wendy Evans Lehmann, Annotation, <i>Estate Created By Deed To Persons Described As Husband And Wife But Not Legally Married</i> 	69 ALR5th 219 (1999) 9 ALR4th 1189 (1981)
Tort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sonja A. Soehnel, Annotation, <i>Action For Loss Of Consortium Based On Nonmarital Cohabitation</i> Charles Plovovich, Annotation, <i>Recovery For Loss Of Consortium For Injury Occurring Prior To Marriage</i> 	40 ALR4th 553 (1985) 5 ALR4th 300 (1981)

ALR Annotations:

Cohabitation without Marriage

Subject	Title of Annotation	Citation
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Vitauts M. Gulbis, Annotation, <i>Validity Of Ordinance Restricting Number Of Unrelated Persons Who Can Live Together In Residential Zoning</i>	12 ALR4th 238 (1982)

§ 2.2 During Divorce

2002 Edition

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic sources relating to the effect on alimony, custody and visitation of a spouse's cohabitation while a divorce action is pending.
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2002)
 - § 46b-40 Grounds for dissolution of marriage; legal separation; annulment
 - (c) (3) adultery
 - (c) (8) intolerable cruelty
 - § 53a-81 Adultery: Class A Misdemeanor.
- REPEALED.** P.A. 91-19 §2 (effective Oct. 1, 1991)
- LEGISLATIVE HISTORIES:**
- 1991 CONN. ACTS 19. An act concerning adultery. Substitute House Bill No. 5082.
- CASES:**
- Venuti v. Venuti, 185 Conn. 156, 159, 440 A.2d 878 (1981). “A review of the record shows that the trial court did not err in finding that adultery was not the cause of the breakdown of the marriage. There is, therefore, no basis in the statutes for the trial court to have considered any adultery by the plaintiff in making its award of alimony and counsel fees and the trial court did not abuse its discretion when it made those awards.”
 - Robinson v. Robinson, 187 Conn. 70, 72, 444 A.2d 234 (1982). “ While alimony, in whatever form, or an assignment of property is not to be considered either as a reward for virtue or as a punishment for wrongdoing, a spouse whose conduct has contributed substantially to the breakdown of the marriage should not expect to receive financial kudos for his or her misconduct. Moreover, in considering the gravity of such misconduct it is entirely proper for the court to assess the impact of the errant spouse's conduct on the other spouse. Because in making its assignment of property the trial court had a reasonable basis for its disposition we see no reason for disturbing the result.
- WEST KEY NUMBERS:**
- Husband and Wife # 279
 - Divorce # 245
- DIGESTS:**
- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: Cohabitation
- ENCYCLOPEDIAS:**
- See [Table 2: ALR Annotations: Cohabitation During Divorce](#)
- TEXTS & TREATISES:**
- ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS [Vol. 7 & 8 CONNECTICUT PRACTICE BOOK ANNOTATED].
 - Chapter 32 Alimony in general
 - § 32.2 Award to either spouse.
 - Discussion of the effect of adultery on alimony award*
 - § 32.17 Other factors considered
 - Discussion of Robinson v. Robinson*
 - Chapter 41 Child custody and visitation
 - § 41.31 Causes for dissolution

LAW REVIEWS:

- Paul Smith, *Jurisprudence And Adultery In Modern Day Connecticut*, 3 CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW JOURNAL 1 (November 1984).
“What do you tell your clients when they ask what they can do socially after commencing a dissolution action.”

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Branch, Law Library At Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL: Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 5 ALR annotations on cohabitation during divorce

<h2 style="text-align: center;">ALR Annotations:</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Cohabitation During Divorce</h3>	
Subject	Title of Annotation
Adultery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotation, <i>Cohabitation Under Marriage Contracted After Divorce Decree As Adultery, Where Decree Later Reversed Or Set Aside</i>, 63 ALR2d 816 (1959)
Alimony	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, <i>Effect Of Same-Sex Relationship On Right To Spousal Support</i>, 73 ALR5th 599 (1999). • Kristine Cordier Karnezis, Annotation, <i>Adulterous Wife's Right To Permanent Alimony</i>, 86 ALR3d 97 (1978)
Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, <i>Child Custody And Visitation Rights Arising From Same-Sex Relationship</i>, 80 ALR5th 1 (2000) • Diane M. Allen, Annotation, <i>Propriety Of Provision Of Custody Or Visitation Order Designed To Insulate Child From Parent's Extramarital Sexual Relationships</i>, 40 ALR4th 812 (1985)
Inheritance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gregory G. Sarno, Annotation, <i>Rights in decedent's estate as between lawful and putative spouses</i>, 81 ALR3d 453 (1980).

Table 6 Unreported Connecticut decisions on adultery during divorce

Unreported Connecticut Decisions: Adultery During Divorce	
<p><u>Morson v. Morson</u>, No. FA99 0175656 S (Sep. 13, 2001), 2001 Ct. Sup. 12743, 2001 WL 1200315.</p>	<p>The parties' final separation occurred on November 17, 1999 when, after requesting a divorce, the defendant left the home. The court finds that the defendant's one act of adultery prior to the final separation did not contribute to the marriage breakdown which was total prior to that episode, <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 156 (1981).</p>
<p><u>Marchiano v. Marchiano</u>, No. FA96 0156039 S (Nov. 28, 1997), 1997 Ct. Sup. 11568, 11569, 1997 WL 753406.</p>	<p>The causes of the marriage breakdown are found rooted in a generalized incompatibility of life style. The marriage was irretrievably broken down by the summer of 1996. Each party has behaved as an unmarried person since then, 185 <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 156 Conn. The court concludes that fault is not to be assigned to either party.</p>
<p><u>Blackburn v. Blackburn</u>, No. FA95 0144698 S (Nov. 6, 1997), 1997 Ct. Sup. 12093, 12095, 1997 WL 724499.</p>	<p>In April, 1996, the defendant returned to the marital home at 2:00 a.m. to find the plaintiff with a man who the defendant assaulted. Since this episode occurred one year after this dissolution suit was commenced, the court finds such evidence not relevant to the causes of the marriage breakdown, <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 156 (1981).</p>
<p><u>Paul v. Paul</u>, No. FA93 0117672 S (Sep. 29, 1994), 1994 Ct. Sup. 9738, 9741-9742, 1994 WL 564051.</p>	<p>Regarding the defendant's adultery as impacting on the custody issue, it is correct that a party's morals as demonstrated by conduct may be considered by the court. <u>Adams v. Adams</u>, 180 Conn. 498; <u>Sullivan v. Sullivan</u>, 141 Conn. 235. The plaintiff's living with Mrs. Goodwin occurred after the breakdown and is not considered as bearing on fault. <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 156. The court can consider the behavior of each party to the time of trial in determining how each party's behavior may impact the child, for the question is not who was the better custodian in the past, but which party is the better custodian now. <u>Yontel v. Yontel</u>, 185 Conn. 275, 283.</p>
<p><u>Buechele v. Buechele</u>, No. 32 54 02 (May 26, 1993), 1993 Ct. Sup. 5251, 5254, 1993 WL 190426.</p>	<p>In <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 156, 159 (1981), the court stated in part as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"A review of the record shows that the trial court did not err in finding that adultery was not the cause of the breakdown of the marriage. There is, therefore, no basis in the statutes for the trial court to have considered any adultery by the plaintiff in making its award of alimony and counsel fees. . . ."</p> <p>The court finds that the defendant's involvement with a third party and her existing pregnancy is not a factor in the cause of the breakdown of the marriage.</p>

Unreported Connecticut Decisions: Adultery During Divorce

<p><u>Mason v. Mason</u>, No. 30 06 62 (Nov. 8, 1991), 1991 Ct. Sup. 9485, 9490-91, 1991 WL 240727.</p>	<p>In <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 156 (1981), our Supreme Court considered the questions of awarding alimony and counsel fees to an adulterous spouse. The Court noted on pages 157 and 158 that, under the dissolution statute, adultery is one of ten causes for granting a dissolution but a trial court may dissolve a marriage with irretrievable breakdown as the basis even though another cause is proven. Also that adultery is not listed as a factor in General Statutes 46b-62, 46b-82 to be considered in making an award unless it is one of causes of the dissolution; and further that, as a cause, it is only a factor to consider together with all the other factors enumerated in the General Statutes; and concluding on page 148 with the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Thus, there is no longer a foundation for the claim that as a matter of law it is an abuse of discretion to award alimony and counsel fees to an adulterous spouse."</p> <p>In the Venuti case the trial court found that the adultery was not a cause of the breakdown.</p>
<p><u>Foley v. Foley</u>, No. FA-89-292125 (Apr. 10, 1991), 1991 Ct. Sup. 3105, 3106-3107, 1991 WL 61184.</p>	<p>The court does not find that adultery was the cause of the breakdown of this marriage. There is, therefore, no basis in the statutes and case law for this court to have considered any adultery by the plaintiff in making any award of alimony, etc., <u>Venuti v. Venuti</u>, 185 Conn. 159. Adultery will not be inferred from circumstantial evidence, unless there is both an opportunity and an adulterous disposition. <u>Eberhard v. Eberhard</u>, 4 N.J. 535 (1950). Moreover, the existence of both the opportunity and the inclination without more does not necessarily compel a conclusion that adultery has occurred. <u>Antonata v. Antonata</u>, 85 Conn. 390 (1912).</p>

§ 2.3 Following Divorce

2002 Edition

SCOPE:

Bibliographic sources relating to the effect on alimony, custody and visitation of cohabitation after a divorce is final.

DEFINITIONS:

- **Cohabitation vs. living together:** “Section 46b-86 (b) does not use the word cohabitation. The legislature instead ‘chose the broader language of ‘living with another person’ rather than ‘cohabitation’. . . .’ Because, however, ‘living with another’ person without financial benefit did not establish sufficient reason to refashion an award of alimony under General Statutes § 46b-81, the legislature imposed the additional requirement that the party making alimony payments prove that the living arrangement has resulted in a change in circumstances that alters the financial needs of the alimony recipient. Therefore, this additional requirement, in effect, serves as a limitation. Pursuant to § 46b-86 (b), the nonmarital union must be one with attendant financial consequences before the trial court may alter an award of alimony.” DeMaria v. DeMaria, 247 Conn. 715, 720, 724 A.2d 1088 (1999).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 46b-86(b). Modification of alimony or support orders and judgments.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORIES:

- P.A. 77-394. The "cohabitation" statute. H.B. No. 6174 (1977 Session).

FORMS:

- *Motion for modification of alimony based on cohabitation* $\frac{3}{4}$ Form, 8
ARNOLD H. RUTKIN, CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000) § 35.32.

CASES:

- DiStefano v. DiStefano, 67 Conn. App. 628, 633, 787 A.2d 675 (2002). “In accordance with General Statutes § 46b-86 (b) and the holding in DeMaria, before the payment of alimony can be modified or terminated, two requirements must be established. First, it must be shown that the party receiving the alimony is cohabitating with another individual. If it is proven that there is cohabitation, the party seeking to alter the terms of the alimony payments must then establish that the recipient's financial needs have been altered as a result of the cohabitation.”
- DeMaria v. DeMaria, 247 Conn. 715, 719-720, 724 A.2d 1088 (1999). “The Appellate Court essentially treated the word ‘cohabit’ as synonymous with ‘living together,’ and concluded that in view of its finding that the plaintiff was living with an unrelated male, the trial court should have terminated her alimony We conclude, in accordance with the definition contained in § 46b-86 (b), that the trial court properly construed the term ‘cohabitation’ as used in the dissolution judgment to include the financial impact of the living arrangement on the cohabiting spouse, and accordingly, we reverse the judgment of the Appellate Court.”
- D'Ascanio v. D'Ascanio, 237 Conn. 481, 486, 678 A.2d 469 (1996). “On her cross appeal, however, the defendant asserts that no evidence was presented to support the trial court's finding that her living arrangement with Griffin caused such a change of circumstances as to alter her financial needs. We disagree.”
- Mihalyak v. Mihalyak, 30 Conn. App. 516, 521, 620 A.2d 1327 (1993). “The defendant contends, and we agree, that the dissolution judgment itself

provided for termination of the alimony upon the occurrence of the plaintiff's cohabitation. The provisions of General Statutes § 46b-86 are inapplicable. The trial court should have considered the terms of the dissolution decree, which incorporated the agreement of the parties in the form of a stipulation."

- Charpentier v. Charpentier, 206 Conn. 150, 152, 536 A.2d 948 (1988). "A major contention of the defendant is that the trial court's financial orders were impermissibly influenced by her admitted lesbian sexual preference. We conclude that the trial court's financial orders were not so premised, but instead reasonably reflected the economic burden imposed on the plaintiff by the custody decree as the parent primarily responsible for raising five young children."
- Duhl v. Duhl, 7 Conn. App. 92, 94, 507 A.2d 523 (1986). "The plaintiff argues, however, that 46b-86(b) requires a substantial change in circumstances and some finding by the court that the relationship will endure before a court may terminate alimony. The plaintiff summarized this claim during oral argument before this court by stating that the trial court must find a substantial change in financial circumstances, namely the financial interdependence such as is found in a common law marriage, before it may order the termination of alimony payments. No such requirement is to be found in the statute nor do we feel that such a requirement is necessary to fulfill its purpose."
- Connolly v. Connolly, 191 Conn. 468, 475, 464 A.2d 837 (1983). "By its very terms, General Statutes 46b-86(b) mandates that when the statute is to be invoked notice must be given to the parties and a hearing held on the claim."
- Kaplan v. Kaplan, 185 Conn. 42, 45-46, 440 A.2d 252 (1981). "We note that the General Assembly chose the broader language of 'living with another person' rather than 'cohabitation' and that this provision requires only a 'change' of circumstances, not a 'substantial change' as required by 46b-86 (a)."
- Gallo v. Gallo, 184 Conn. 36, 45, 440 A.2d 782 (1981). "The testimony before the trial court concerned only the woman with whom the defendant was cohabiting at the time of the hearing. Thus there is no basis in the evidence for the trial court to extend the restriction to any other woman. The judgment must be modified so that the overnight visitation restriction applies only to the particular woman who was living with the defendant at the time of the hearing."
- McAnerney v. McAnerney, 165 Conn. 277, 287, 334 A.2d 437 (1973). "But no policy or rule of equity makes a divorced wife accountable to her former husband for her conduct . . . any more than it makes the enforcement of a debt contingent on a creditor's chastity."

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Husband and Wife* # 279
- *Divorce* # 245

DIGESTS:

- CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: *Cohabitation*

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 27B C.J.S. *Divorce* (1986).
§ 409. Modification or vacation of allowance—cohabitation of recipient spouse
- 24A AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE 2d *Divorce and Separation* (1998).
§ 793. Recipient spouse's cohabitation with another
§ 794. Remarriage of spouse to each other; resumption of cohabitation
§ 840. Cohabitation of dependent spouse
§ 841. —effect on need for continued support; necessity and burden of

proof

- *Cause Of Action To Obtain Increase In Amount Or Duration Of Alimony Based On Changed Financial Circumstances Of Party*, 19 COA 1 (1989).
 - § 31. Change caused or contributed to by recipient
 - § 33. Other sources of support
- *Modification Of Spousal Support On The Ground Of Supported Spouse's Cohabitation*, 6 POF3d 765 (1989).
- 8 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN, CONNECTICUT PRACTICE, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000)
 - Chapter 35. Modification of alimony provisions
 - § 35.25. Modification of alimony based upon cohabitation
 - § 35.26. Proof of cohabitation
 - § 35.27. Relief available based upon cohabitation
 - Chapter 42. Child custody and visitation
 - §42.2. Rights of unmarried or non-cohabiting parents
 - §42.38. Restrictions on care and supervision
 - Chapter 44. Modification of custody and visitation orders
 - §44.16. Remarriage or cohabitation of parent
- 2 FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT (1996).
 - Chapter 9. *Alimony in Divorce—Spousal Support*
 - § 9.14 Cohabitation considerations

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

PAMPHLETS:

- LEGAL ASSISTANCE RESOURCE CENTER, HOW TO MODIFY CHILD SUPPORT AND ALIMONY ORDERS (August 2000).
http://www.larcc.org/pamphlets/children_family/modify_child_support_and_alimony.htm

LAW REVIEWS:

- Edward S. Snyder, *Post-divorce Cohabitation And Its Effect On Spousal Support*, 1 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF FAMILY LAW 57 (Spring 1987).

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman, Connecticut Judicial Branch, Law Library At Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. EMAIL:
Lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 7 ALR annotation on cohabitation following divorce

<h2 style="text-align: center;">ALR Annotations:</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Cohabitation Following Divorce</h3>	
Subject	Title of Annotation
Alimony, Modification of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane M. Allen, Annotation, <i>Divorced Or Separated Spouse's Living With Member Of Opposite Sex As Affecting Other Spouse's Obligation Of Alimony Or Support Under Separation Agreement</i>, 47 ALR4th 38 (1986). • Annotation, <i>Divorced Woman's Subsequent Sexual Relations Or Misconduct As Warranting, Alone Or With Other Circumstances, Modification Of Alimony Decrees</i>, 98 ALR3d 453 (1980).
Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Cheryl Miller, Annotation, <i>Child Custody And Visitation Rights Arising From Same-Sex Relationship</i>, 80 ALR5th 1 (2000) • Diane M. Allen, Annotation, <i>Propriety Of Provision Of Custody Or Visitation Order Designed To Insulate Child From Parent's Extramarital Sexual Relationships</i>, 40 ALR4th 812 (1985) • Annotation, <i>Custodial Parent's Sexual Relations With Third Person As Justifying Modification Of Child Custody Order</i>, 100 ALR3d 625 (1980).

Figure 1 Motion for modification and/or termination of periodic alimony

DOCKET NO. FA 97 0161402 S : SUPERIOR COURT
JOSEPH DISTEFANO : JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
STAMFORD/NORWALK
VS. : AT STAMFORD
RENE DISTEFANO SEPTEMBER 1, 2000

MOTION FOR MODIFICATION AND/OR TERMINATION OF PERIODIC ALIMONY

[POST JUDGMENT]

The plaintiff, JOSEPH DISTEFANO, by and through his attorneys, Piazza & Pickel, hereby moves that this Honorable Court modify the existing alimony order as there has been a substantial change in financial circumstances since the entering of the orders. In support hereof, plaintiff sets forth as follows:

1. That the marriage of the parties was dissolved on an uncontested basis on October 14, 1998 (Kavanewsky, J.).
2. That the Agreement dated October 14, 1998, which was incorporated into the judgment of dissolution sets forth orders with respect to alimony.
3. Specifically, the order provides as follows:

ARTICLE IV - ALIMONY

(4.1.) The Husband shall pay to the Wife as periodic alimony, the sum of \$1,505.60 per month commencing November 1, 1998 payable on the 1st of each month which shall terminate upon the first to occur: the death of either party, remarriage of the Wife, cohabitation by the Wife pursuant to statute...

4. Since the entering of the above referenced orders, the Wife has cohabitated and therefore, a modification or termination of the alimony order is necessary.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff moves that this court modify the following existing periodic alimony order by terminating the order.

THE PLAINTIFF

JOSEPH DISTEFANO

BY _____

Name

Firm

Address

Phone number Juris Number

Table 8 Unpublished Connecticut Decisions: Cohabitation following divorce

<h2 style="text-align: center;">Unpublished Connecticut Decisions: Cohabitation Following Divorce</h2>	
<p><u>Santese (DeNunzio) v. Santese</u>, FA 96-00727935 (Mar. 14, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 3272, 3274, 2002 WL 521393.</p>	<p>Although the parties have stipulated that the plaintiff and her male friend have lived together since August 2001, they disagree over whether or not those living arrangements have altered the plaintiff's financial needs.</p> <p>The plaintiff contends that she continues to maintain herself financially ". . . and receives no financial benefits . . . other than an indirect benefit that would be provided by sharing living quarters with any roommate." (Plaintiff's Summary of Law). The plaintiff argues that although the amount she pays for rent may be lower, her overall financial circumstances have not been improved by her current living arrangement.</p> <p>The court is not persuaded.</p>
<p><u>Keeys v. Keeys</u>, No. FA 93-0355163 S (Mar. 19, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 3569, 3571, 2002 WL 532425.</p>	<p>In this case, the judgment provided that alimony would terminate upon the issuance of an order terminating alimony pursuant to 46b-86 (b). That is not self executing. Moreover, the statute does not require termination upon a finding that an alimony recipient is living with another person, but also includes modification, suspension, or reduction as relief for a payor. The Mihalalyak decision does not alter the principle that alimony cannot be modified retroactively. <u>Sanchione v. Sanchione</u>, 173 Conn. 397 (1977).</p> <p>The court denies so much of the defendant's motion as seeks to have the modification of alimony be made retroactive to the date the plaintiff's cohabitation began, but grants the defendant's motion for attorney's fees.</p>
<p><u>Stranko v. Stranko</u>, No. FA93 030 11 74 (Feb. 28, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 2028, 2030-2031, 2002 WL 450471.</p>	<p>Therefore, the holding in Connelly that the recipient of alimony must have notice through a motion for modification that she is facing a request to terminate alimony because of cohabitation in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes § 46b-86 (b) is clearly not applicable to this case. The plaintiff herein is not asking this court to terminate the defendant's alimony. The plaintiff is asking the court to prevent the defendant from enforcing a claim for arrearage as a result of conduct on her part that constitutes laches, equitable estoppel or waiver.</p>
<p><u>Iadarola v. Iadarola</u>, No. FA98 035 65 52 S (Aug. 10, 2001), 2001 Ct. Sup. 10975, 10976, 2001 WL 1044627.</p>	<p>The Appellate Court recently has explained the difference between a termination of alimony because of operation of a cohabitation clause in a judgment and a modification under § 46b-86 (b) of the General Statutes. <u>DeMaria v. DeMaria</u>, 47 Conn. App. 672 (1998). The latter required proof of living together and a resultant change in the alimony recipient's financial circumstances. <u>Mihalalyak v. Mihalalyak</u>, 30 Conn. App. 516, 520-21 (1993).</p>

3

Cohabitation Agreements in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

Definition:

- “. . . cohabitation alone does not create any contractual relationship or, unlike marriage, impose any other legal duties upon the parties. In this jurisdiction, common law marriages are not accorded validity.” Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 339, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). .
- “Ordinary contract principles are not suspended, however, for unmarried persons living together, whether or not they engage in sexual activity.” Ibid.

Sections in this chapter:

§ 1 INTRODUCTION	61
§ 2 VALIDITY	62
§ 3 GROUNDS	64
§ 3a <i>Expressed or implied contract</i>	65
§ 3b <i>Implied partnership agreement or joint venture</i>	69
§ 3c <i>Quantum meruit</i>	71
§ 4 FORM AND CONTENT	73
§ 5 REMEDIES & ENFORCEMENT	78

Tables in this section:

Table 9 Proof of Existence, Terms, and Breach of Express Oral Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants.....	66
Table 10 Proof of Existence and Breach of Implied-In-Fact Contract for Services	68
Table 11 Proof of Implied Partnership Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants.....	70
Table 12 Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements	75

Index

Cohabitation Agreements

Arbitration clause, Table 12	Oral contract, § 3.2
Bank accounts (clause), Table 12	Partnership vs. joint venture, definition, § 3.3b
Basic agreement (form), Table 12	Proof of
Checklist, § 12	breach of oral agreement, Table 9
Children (clause), Table 12	contract, § 3.3a
Cohabitation, definition, Title page	implied-in-fact contract, Table 10
Common law marriage, Title page	partnership agreement, Table 11
Constructive contracts, § 3.3a	Property rights, § 3.2
Constructive trust, § 3.3c	Property, joint (clause), Table 12
Content of cohabitation agreement , § 3.4	Property, separate (clause), Table 12
Debts (clause), Table 12	Public policy, violative of, § 3.2
Disclosure clause, Table 12	Quantum meruit , § 3.3c
Employment (clause), Table 12	Quasi-contract, §§ 3.2, 3.3c
Enforcement , § 3.5	Recitals (clause), Table 12
Express contract , § 3.3a	Recovery for services rendered, § 3.2
Form , § 3.4	Remedies , § 3.5
Grounds , § 3.3	Sample clauses for cohabitation agreement, Table 12
Implied contract , § 3.3a	Sexual relationship, contracts for, § 3.2, 3.3a
Implied joint venture , § 3.3b	Support (clause), Table 12
Implied partnership , § 3.3b	Taxes (clause), Table 12
Implied-in-fact agreements, § 3.3b	Temporary living expenses, § 3.2
Inheritance, (clause), Table 12	Termination (clause), Table 12
Invalid marriage, § 3.3a	Unjust enrichment, § 3.3c
Joint venture vs. partnership, § 3.3b	Validity , § 3.2
Meretricious, § 3.2	Visitation (clause), Table 12
Names (clause), Table 12	

Texts and Treatises

ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2000), §§ 3.2, 3.3a, 3.4

SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984), §§ 3.2, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c

ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999), §§ 3.2, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c, 3.4, 3.5

LIVING TOGETHER: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000), § 3.4

For the holdings of individual libraries see <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/lawlib/searchcat.htm>

§ 3.1 Introduction

In 1978 the Supreme Court of Oregon noted in Beal v. Beal, 577 P2d 507, 508:

Historically, courts have been reluctant to grant relief of any kind to a party who was involved in what was termed a ‘meretricious’ relationship. Courts took the position that the parties had entered into a relationship outside the bounds of law, and the courts would not allow themselves to be used to solve the property disputes evolving from that relationship. Generally, the parties were left as they were when they came to court, with ownership resting in whoever happened to have title or possession at the time. The rationale was predicated on public policy or even an invocation of the clean hand doctrine.

In 1976 the California Supreme Court decided Marvin v. Marvin, 557 P.2d 106, 116:

In summary, we base our opinion on the principle that adults who voluntarily live together and engage in sexual relations are nonetheless as competent as any other person to contract respecting their earnings and property rights. Of course, they cannot lawfully contract to pay for the performance of sexual services, for such a contract is, in essence, an agreement for prostitution and unlawful for that reason. But they may agree to pool their earnings and to hold all property acquired during the relationship in accord with the law governing community property; conversely they may agree that each partner’s earnings and the property acquired from those earnings remains the separate property of the earning partner. So long as the agreement does not rest upon illicit meretricious consideration, the parties may order their economic affairs as they choose, and no policy precludes the courts from enforcing such agreements.

§ 3.2 Validity

2002 EDITION

SCOPE

Bibliographic resources relating to the validity of unmarried cohabitation agreements in Connecticut

DEFINITIONS:

- “Ordinary contract principles are not suspended, however, for unmarried persons living together, whether or not they engage in sexual activity.” Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 339, 521 A.2d 142 (1987).
- “We conclude that our public policy does not prevent the enforcement of agreements regarding property rights between unmarried cohabitants in a sexual relationship.” *Ibid.*, p. 342.
- “[W]here the parties have established an unmarried, cohabiting relationship, it is the specific conduct of the parties within that relationship that determines their respective rights and obligations, including the treatment of their individual property Any such finding must be determined by reference to the unique circumstances and arrangements between the parties present in each case. Those matters are questions of fact that are within the singular province of the trial court, and can only be determined by evaluating the credibility of the witnesses and weighing conflicting evidence.” Herring v. Daniels, 70 Conn. App. 649, 656 (2002).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 46b-61. Orders re children where parents live separately.

FORMS:

- 14 AM JUR PLEADING AND PRACTICE *Husband and Wife* §22 (1996).
Complaint, petition, or declaration—To enforce oral contract—Parties to live together without marriage—For declaration of rights, partition of property, support or damages—Property held in constructive trust with duty to reconvey to woman

CASES:

- Herring v. Daniels, 70 Conn. App. 649, 655 (2002). “The plaintiff apparently interprets the phrase ‘in the manner of husband and wife’ to suggest that cohabitation is for all intents and purposes synonymous with marriage, and that cohabitation raises all of the same presumptions regarding the treatment of assets as does marriage. Such an interpretation, however, would essentially transform cohabitation into common-law marriage, contrary to the refusal of this state to recognize such relationships.”
- Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 339, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). “Contracts expressly providing for the performance of sexual acts, of course, have been characterized as meretricious and held unenforceable as violative of public policy.”
- Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 380, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987). “Claims of a contractual or quasi-contractual nature between parties in illicit relationships but which do not involve payment for prohibited sexual behavior are enforceable in courts of law.”

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- Implied and Constructive Contracts #47
- Contracts #112 Immorality

DIGESTS:

- ALR Digest: Unmarried Cohabitants

- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: Cohabitation

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- George L. Blum, Annotation, *Property Rights Arising From Relationship of Couple Cohabiting Without Marriage*, 69 ALR5th 219 (1999).
- Jean E. Maess, Annotation, *Order Awarding Temporary Support or Living Expenses Upon Separation of Unmarried Partners Pending Contract Action Based on Services Relating to Personal Relationship*, 35 ALR4th 409 (1985).
- Jane Massey Draper, Annotation, *Recovery for Services Rendered by Persons Living in Apparent Relation of Husband and Wife Without Express Agreement for Compensation*, 94 ALR3d 552 (1979).

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2000).
Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried cohabitations
 §47.3 Validity
- SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984).
 Chapter 3 Cohabitation
 §3.03 The extension of marital and familial rights to unmarried cohabitants
- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
 Chapter 100 Cohabitation Agreements
 §100.61 Recognition of cohabitation agreements

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 3.3 Grounds

“In the absence of an express contract, the courts should inquire into the conduct of the parties to determine whether that conduct demonstrates an implied contract, agreement of partnership or joint venture, or some other tacit understanding between the parties. The courts may also employ the doctrine of quantum meruit, or equitable remedies such as constructive or resulting trusts, when warranted by the facts of the case.” Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 340-41, 521 A.2d 142 (1987), quoting Marvin v. Marvin, 18 Cal. 3d 660, 665, 134 Cal. Rptr. 815, 557 P.2d 106 (1976).” Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 380-381, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987).

§ 3.3a Expressed or Implied Contract

2002 Edition

SCOPE

Bibliographic resources relating to the requisites of express or implied contracts between unmarried cohabitants in Connecticut

DEFINITIONS:

- **Express Agreement:** "is one in which the parties arrive at their agreement by words, either oral or written." Martens v. Metzgar, 524 P.2d 666, 671(1974).
- **Implied Contract:** "is an agreement between the parties which is not expressed in words but which is inferred from the acts and the conduct of the parties The test is whether the conduct and acts of the parties show an agreement." Brighenti v. New Britain Shirt Corporation, 167 Conn. 403, 406, 268 A.2d 391 (1974).

CASES:

CONNECTICUT

- Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 340-341, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). "In the absence of an express contract, the courts should inquire into the conduct of the parties to determine whether that conduct demonstrates an implied contract"
- Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 380, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987). "Claims of a contractual or quasi-contractual nature between parties in illicit relationships but which do not involve payment for prohibited sexual behavior are enforceable in courts of law."
- Bridgeport Pipe Engineering Co. v. DeMatteo Construction Co., 159 Conn. 242, 249, 268 A.2d 391 (1970). "To constitute an offer and acceptance sufficient to create an enforceable contract, each must be found to have been based on an identical understanding by the parties."

OTHER STATES

- Marvin v. Marvin, 557 P.2d 106 (1976) [California].
- Beal v. Beal, 577 P.2d 507(1978) [Oregon].

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- Marriage #54 Effect of informal or invalid marriage
- Contract # 112 Immorality
- Implied and constructive contracts # 47

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 17A AM JUR 2D *Contracts* (1991).
§§ 12-15. Express, implied, or constructive contracts
- *Property Rights Of Unmarried Cohabitants*, 46 AM JUR PROOF OF FACTS 2D 495 (1986).
§4. Implied-in-fact agreement between cohabitants—in general
- *Terms Of Oral Contracts With The Decedent*, 39 AM JUR PROOF OF FACTS 2D 91 (1984).
§§ 30-37. Proof of contract between unmarried cohabitants

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2nd ed. 2000).
Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried cohabitations
§ 47.3. Validity
- SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984).

- Chapter 3 Cohabitation
 § 3.17. Express contract
 § 3.19. Implied-in-fact contracts
- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
 Chapter 100. Cohabitation Agreements

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 9 Proof of Existence, Terms, and Breach of Express Oral Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants

Proof of Existence, Terms, and Breach of Express Oral Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants 46 Proof of Facts 2d 495-496 “Property rights of unmarried cohabitants,” by John Francis Major	
Testimony of Plaintiff	
§ 10	Parties’ cohabitation
§ 11	Existence and terms of express oral agreement
§ 12	Parties’ acquisition of property
§ 13	Plaintiff’s performance of agreement
§ 14	Defendant’s breach of agreement
Testimony of Plaintiff’s Friend	
§ 15	Existence of express agreement
§ 16	Plaintiff’s performance of agreement

Table 10

Proof of Existence and Breach of Implied-In-Fact Contract for Services

Proof of Existence and Breach of Implied-In-Fact Contract for Services 46 Proof of Facts 2d 496 “Property rights of unmarried cohabitants,” by John Francis Major	
Testimony of Plaintiff	
§ 17	Parties’ cohabitation
§ 18	Pooling of resources; sharing of expenses
§ 19	Plaintiff’s giving up of job to render household and related services
§ 20	Parties’ acquisition of property
§ 21	Plaintiff’s understanding as to rights in acquired property
§ 22	Parties held themselves out as husband and wife
§ 23	Plaintiff’s performance of implied agreement
§ 24	Defendant’s breach of implied agreement
Testimony of Plaintiff’s Friend	
§ 25	Witness’ acquaintance with parties
§ 26	Parties held themselves out as husband and wife
§ 27	Defendant’s statement regarding ownership of property

§ 3.3b Implied Partnership Agreement or Joint Venture

2002 EDITION

SCOPE

Bibliographic resources relating to the requisites of an implied partnership agreement or joint venture between unmarried cohabitants in Connecticut

DEFINITIONS:

- “The distinction between a partnership and a joint venture is often slight, the former commonly entered into to carry on a general business, while the latter is generally limited to a single transaction.” Travis v. St. John, 176 Conn. 69, 72, 404 A.2d 885 (1978).

CASES:

CONNECTICUT

- Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 340-341, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). “In the absence of an express contract, the courts should inquire into the conduct of the parties to determine whether that conduct demonstrates . . . agreement of partnership or joint venture or some other tacit understanding between the parties.”

OTHER STATES

- Estate of Thornton, 499 P.2d 864, 868 (1972). “She and Ray Thornton jointly contributed their labor to the cattle and farming enterprise; the evidence reveals that they shared in the decision making concerning the enterprise; and, necessarily, they benefited jointly from the profits thereof. From the circumstances of their relationship and their acts in the management of the farming business, the existence of a contract of partnership can be inferred.”

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- *Partnership* # 15, 20, 22, 26, 52, 111, 218(3)
- *Joint Ventures*

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- George L. Blum, Annotation, *Property Rights Arising From Relationship of Couple Cohabiting Without Marriage*, 69 ALR5th 219 (1999). §9 Partnership agreement or joint venture
- *Property Rights Of Unmarried Cohabitants*, 46 AM JUR PROOF OF FACTS 2D 495 (1986).
 - § 6. Implied-in-fact agreement between cohabitants—partnership, joint venture, or pooling agreement
 - §§ 28-36. Proof of implied partnership agreement between unmarried cohabitants

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984).
 - Chapter 3 Cohabitation
 - § 3.21 Implied partnership and joint venture
- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
 - Chapter 100 Cohabitation Agreements

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 11 Proof of Implied Partnership Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants

Proof of Implied Partnership Agreement Between Unmarried Cohabitants 46 Poof of Facts 2d 496 “Property rights of unmarried cohabitants,” by John Francis Major	
A. Testimony of Plaintiff	
§ 28	Parties’ cohabitation
§ 29	Purchase of business property
§ 30	Plaintiff’s prior employment
§ 31	Nature of the business enterprise
§ 32	Commencement and expansion of the business
§ 33	Parties’ contribution of capital to business; pooling of resources
§ 34	Plaintiff’s maintenance of business records
§ 35	Other services rendered by plaintiff
§ 36	Parties’ joint liability for indebttness
B. Testimony of Customer	
§ 37	Parties held themselves out as partners

§ 3.3c Quantum Meruit

2002 EDITION

SCOPE

Bibliographic resources relating to unmarried cohabitant seeking equitable relief under the doctrine of quantum meruit.

DEFINITIONS:

- **Quantum meruit:** “Literally translated, the phrase ‘quantum meruit’ means ‘as much as he deserved.’ ‘Quantum meruit’ is a liability on a contract implied by law It is premised on the finding of an implied promise to pay the plaintiff as much as he reasonable deserves, and it is concerned with the amount of damages resulting from an implied promise by the defendant to pay.” *Derr v. Moddy*, 5 Conn. Cir. 718, 721-722, 261 A.2d 290(1969).
- **Unjust enrichment:** “This doctrine is based upon the principle that one should not be permitted unjustly to enrich himself at the expense of another but should be required to make restitution of or for property receive, retained or appropriated” *Franks v. Lockwood*, 146 Conn. 273, 278, 150 A.2d 215 (1959).
- **Comparison:** “. . . unjust enrichment has been the form of action commonly pursued in this jurisdiction when the benefit that the enriched party receives is either money or property Quantum meruit, by comparison, is the form of action which has been utilized when the benefit received was the work, labor, or services of the party seeking restitution.” *Burns v. Koellmer*, 11 Conn. App. 375, 384, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987)..

CASES:

- *Boland v. Catalano*, 202 Conn. 333, 340-341, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). “The courts may also employ the doctrine of quantum meruit”
- *Burns v. Koellmer*, 11 Conn. App. 375, 383-384, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987).
Quantum meruit is the remedy available to a party when the trier of fact determines that an implied contract for services existed between the parties, and that, therefore, the plaintiff is entitled to the reasonable value of services rendered Such contracts are determined from the evidence of the parties’ course of conduct which implies a promise to pay for the services rendered. The pleadings must allege facts to support the theory that the defendant, by knowingly accepting the services of the plaintiff and representing to her that she would be compensated in the future, impliedly promised to pay her for the services she rendered.

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- Implied and constructive contracts #30

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 66 AM JUR 2D *Restitution and Implied Contracts* (2001).
§ 78. Husband and wife; unmarried cohabitation
- *Cause of Action by Unmarried Cohabitant to Enforce Agreement or Understanding Regarding Support or Division of Property*, 8 CAUSES OF ACTION 2D 1 (1995).
§ 16. Quantum meruit
- *Property Rights Of Unmarried Cohabitants*, 46 AM JUR PROOF OF FACTS 2D 495 (1986).
§ 8. Recovery in quantum meruit or by imposition of constructive trust

TEXTS &

- SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW

TREATISES:

AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984).

Chapter 3 Cohabitation

§ 3.20. Quasi contract and the valuation of domestic
service

- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION
AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
Chapter 100. Cohabitation Agreements

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial
Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT
06457. (860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

§ 3.4 Form and Content

2002 EDITION

- SCOPE:** Bibliographic resources relating to the form and content of a written cohabitation agreements
- STATUTES:**
- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2001)
§ 46b-61. Orders re children where parents live separately
- FORMS:**
- 9B AM JUR LEGAL FORMS (2002 rev.)
 - § 139:141. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried
 - § 139:142. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—Residence owned by one party
 - § 139:143. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—Provisions for custody and support
 - § 139:144. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—Joint purchase of real estate
 - § 139:145. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—Joint purchase of real estate—Another form
 - § 139:146. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—To share residence, earnings, and accumulated property—No provision for support
 - § 139:147. Nonmarital agreement—between parties living together remaining unmarried—Parties have child
 - § 139:148. Termination of cohabitation agreement—Parties have child
 - § 139:149. Termination of cohabitation agreement—One party has child—One party to buy out other's interest in jointly owned real estate
 - §§ 139:150 - 159. Optional provisions
 - 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
Chapter 100 Cohabitation Agreements
Forms 100.10 – 100.35
 - 5 NICOLS CYCLOPEDIA OF LEGAL FORMS
§ 5.555. Unmarried couples—Basic agreement
 - 7 WEST'S LEGAL FORMS (rev. 2d ed. 1995).
Chapter 11 Cohabitation Agreements
 - § 11.3. Cohabitation agreement—parties have children
 - § 11.4. Cohabitation agreement—parties have no children between them
 - § 11.5. Cohabitation agreement between parties with no children—Joint purchase of real estate
 - § 11.6. Cohabitation termination agreement
- CHECKLISTS:**
- 9B AM JUR LEGAL FORMS (2002 rev.)
 - § 139:137. Form drafting guide
 - § 139:138. Form drafting guide—checklist—matters to be considered in drafting a nonmarital cohabitation agreement
 - 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried

cohabitants

§ 47.5. Particular clauses [*suggested inclusions and alternatives*]

- 5 NICOLS CYCLOPEDIA OF LEGAL FORMS (1991).
§ 5.555 Drafting checklist—Nonmarital cohabitation agreement
- 7 WEST'S LEGAL FORMS (rev. 2d ed. 1995).
Chapter 11. Cohabitation Agreements
§ 11.2. Checklist

CASES:

- Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 521 A.2d 142 (1987). *Cohabitation and the enforcement of contracts and agreements between parties.*
- Vibert v. Atchley, 16 Conn. L. Rptr. No. 19, 604, 1996 WL 364777 (July 8, 1996). *Bankruptcy and a signed cohabitation agreement.*

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- Implied and Constructive Contracts #47
- Work and Labor #25

DIGESTS:

- ALR Digest: Unmarried Cohabitants
- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW
CITATIONS: Cohabitation

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 9B AM JUR LEGAL FORMS (2002 rev.)
§ 139:136. Introductory comments
§ 139:137. Form drafting guide
§ 139:138. Form drafting guide—Checklist—Matters to be considered in
drafting nonmarital cohabitation agreement
§ 139:139. Formal requirements—Acknowledgment
§ 139:140. Formal requirements—Statute of frauds
- 8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL. CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES. FAMILY LAW
AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000).
Chapter 47. Property rights and agreements between unmarried cohabitants
§ 47.2. Agreements between unmarried couples [*includes reasons
for entering into an agreement*]
§ 47.3. Validity
§ 47.4. Preparation and execution
§ 47.5. Particular clauses
§ 47.6. Separate property
§ 47.7. Joint purchases and contracts
§ 47.8. Enforcement of cohabitation agreements
§ 47.9. Termination of living together agreements
- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION
AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
Chapter 100 Cohabitation Agreements
- LIVING TOGETHER: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000).
- 5 NICOLS CYCLOPEDIA OF LEGAL FORMS (1991).
§ 5.555. Research checklist—Nonmarital cohabitation agreement
- 7 WEST'S LEGAL FORMS (rev. 2d ed. 1995).
Chapter 11. Cohabitation Agreements

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial
Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457.
(860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table 12 Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements

<h2 style="text-align: center;">Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements</h2>	
Arbitration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arbitration; use of AAA rules; Exclusive remedy. LINDEY §100.30
Bank Accounts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint bank account—Payment of joint expenses, AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:156 • Joint expenses; joint account; proportional contributions. LINDEY §100.23 • Separate bank accounts and credit cards. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:157
Basic Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM JUR LEGAL FORMS §§ 139:135 - 149 • WEST §§ 11.3-11.5
Breach Of Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breach; remedies. LINDEY §100.29
Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement—parties have children. WEST §11.3 • Expenditures on behalf of children; no obligations created. Lindey §100.19 • Legal names of parties and children. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:153 • Support, maintenance, and education of children. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:152 • Visitation rights. LINDEY §100.32
Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment of representation by counsel. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:158 • Recitals; disclosure; separate counsel. LINDEY §100.11
Debts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate property; debts. LINDEY §100.14
Disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recitals; disclosure; separate counsel. LINDEY §100.11
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint contributions to household expenses; one party's employment by other party. LINDEY §100.24

[Cont'd]

Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements [cont'd]

Expenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditures on behalf of children; no obligations created. LINDEY §100.19 • Joint bank account—payment of joint expenses. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS §139:247 • Joint contributions to household expenses; one party's employment by other party. LINDEY §100.24 • Joint expenses; joint account; proportional contributions. LINDEY §100.23 • Sole ownership of residence; effect of joint payment of expenses. LINDEY §100.17
Inheritance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation as beneficiary of various interests; testamentary inclusion. LINDEY §100.25 • Gifts; inheritance. LINDEY §100.18 • No claim on either party's estate. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:155 • Waiver of estate claims. LINDEY §100.26
Name(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal names of parties and children. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:153 • Specific provision; occupancy of premises in name of one party on happening of specific events. LINDEY §100.31
Property, Joint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint property; equal interests presumed. LINDEY §100.15 • Joint property; interests based on contribution. LINDEY §100.16 • Joint purchase of real estate. WEST §11.5 • One wage-earning party—property shared equally. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:150
Property, Separate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One wage-earning party—Property shared equally • Property to be kept separate. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:154 • Separate property, no creation of rights except in writing or specific investment. LINDEY §100.13 • Separate property; debts. LINDEY §100.14 • Sole ownership of residence; effect of joint payment of expenses. LINDEY §100.17 • Occupancy of premises in name of one party. LINDEY §100.31
Recitals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recitals; disclosure; separate counsel. LINDEY §100.11 • Recitals; intention to live together; desire to define financial arrangements; no common law marriage. LINDEY §100.10
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No obligation to support joint resident. LINDEY §100.20 • One wage-earning party—property shared equally. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:150 • Promise to support during joint residency; effect of termination or breach. LINDEY §100.21 • Support in exchange for services; sexual services not included. LINDEY §100.22 • Waiver of right to support or other compensation. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:159

[Cont'd]

Sample Clauses for Cohabitation Agreements [cont'd]

Taxes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Taxes. LINDEY §100.27
Termination	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Termination agreement; no preexisting agreement. LINDEY §100.34• Criteria for dividing property: use of equitable distribution concepts. LINDEY §100.35• Termination of cohabitation agreement. AM JUR LEGAL FORMS § 139:148
Visitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visitation rights. LINDEY §100.32

AM JUR LEGAL FORMS = 9B AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE LEGAL FORMS (2002 rev.)

LINDEY = 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).

WEST = 7 WEST'S LEGAL FORMS (rev. 2d ed.1995). Chapter 11. Cohabitation Agreements.

§ 3.5 Remedies & Enforcement

2002 EDITION

SCOPE

Bibliographic resources relating to the enforcement of cohabitation agreements in Connecticut

CASES:

- Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 521 A.2d 142 (1987).
- Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987).

WEST KEY NUMBERS:

- *Contracts* #112 “Immorality”
- *Implied and constructive contracts*
 - #3 unjust enrichment
 - #30 quantum meruit
- *Marriage* #54
- *Trusts* #103(1)

DIGESTS:

- ALR DIGEST: Unmarried Cohabitants
- CYNTHIA C. GEORGE AND THOMAS D. COLIN. CONNECTICUT FAMILY LAW CITATIONS: Cohabitation

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 17A AM JUR 2D *Contracts* (1991).
 - § 294. Immorality—Agreement for, or between those having , illicit sexual relations; "palimony"
- *Cause Of Action By Unmarried Cohabitant To Enforce Agreement Or Understanding Regarding Support Or Division Of Property*, 8 CAUSES OF ACTION 2D 1 (1995).
 - §32 Remedies—generally
 - §33 Apportionment of joint property
 - §34 Permanent or temporary support

TEXTS & TREATISES:

- 3 ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999).
 - Chapter 100 Cohabitation Agreements
 - §100.69 Termination, remedies, and defenses

COMPILER:

Lawrence Cheeseman , Supervising Law Librarian, Connecticut Judicial Department, Law Library at Middletown, One Court Street, Middletown, CT 06457. (860) 343-6560. Email: lawrence.cheeseman@jud.state.ct.us

Table of Cases

Anonymous v. Norton, 168 Conn. 421, 430 362 A.2d 532 (1975), § 1.7
Antedomenico v. Antedomenico, 142 Conn. 558, 562, 115 A.2d 659 (1955), § 1.6
Beal v. Beal, 577 P2d 507, 508 (1978), § 3.1, 3.3a
Blackburn v. Blackburn, No. FA95 0144698 S (Nov. 6, 1997), 1997 Ct. Sup. 12093, 12095, 1997 WL 724499, Table 6
Boland v. Catalano, 202 Conn. 333, 521 A.2d 142 (1987), Title page (Chapter 3) and §§ 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c, 3.4, 3.5
Bridgeport Pipe Engineering Co. v. DeMatteo Construction Co., 159 Conn. 242, 249, 268 A.2d 391 (1970), § 3.3a
Bristol v. Brundage, 24 Conn. App. 402, 405, 589 A.2d 1 (1991), § 1.6
Buechele v. Buechele, No. 32 54 02 (May 26, 1993), 1993 Ct. Sup. 5251, 5254, 1993 WL 190426, Table 6
Burns v. Koellmer, 11 Conn. App. 375, 380-381, 527 A.2d 1210 (1987), §§ 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.3a, 3.3c, 3.5
Caban v. Mohammed, 441 U.S. 380, 99 S.Ct. 1760, 60 L.Ed. 2d 297 (1979), § 1.1
Champoux v. Porter, No. CV 98 0057585 S (Dec. 2, 1998), 23 Conn. L. Repr. No. 6,219 (January 4, 1999), 1998 WL 867270 (Conn. Super. 1998), Table 3
Charpentier v. Charpentier, 206 Conn. 150, 152, 536 A.2d 948 (1988), § 2.3
Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur, 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S. Ct. 791, 39 L. Ed. 2d 52 (1974), § 1.7a
Connolly v. Connolly, 191 Conn. 468, 475, 464 A.2d 837 (1983), § 2.3
D'Ascanio v. D'Ascanio, 237 Conn. 481, 486, 678 A.2d 469 (1996), § 2.3
Delahunty v. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 236 Conn. 582, 602, 674 A.2d 1290 (1996), § 1.3
DeMaria v. DeMaria, 247 Conn. 715, 719-720, 724 A.2d 1088 (1999), Title page (Chapter 2) and § 2.3
Derr v. Moddy, 5 Conn. Cir. 718, 721-722, 261 A.2d 290 (1969), 3.3c
DiStefano v. DiStefano, 67 Conn. App. 628, 633, 787 A.2d 675 (2002), § 2.3
Doe v. Doe, 244 Conn. 403, 455, 710 A.2d 1297 (1998), § 1.6
Duhl v. Duhl, 7 Conn. App. 92, 94, 507 A.2d 523 (1986), § 2.3
Estate of Thornton, 499 P2d 864, 868 (1972), § 3.3b
Foley v. Foley, No. FA-89-292125 (Apr. 10, 1991), 1991 Ct. Sup. 3105, 3106-3107, 1991 WL 61184, Table 7
Franks v. Lockwood, 146 Conn. 273, 278, 150 A.2d 215 (1959), § 3.3c
Gallo v. Gallo, 184 Conn. 36, 45, 440 A.2d 782 (1981), §§ 2.1, 2.3
Guillev v. Guillev, 196 Conn. 260, 263, 492 A.2d 175 (1985), § 1.3
Herring v. Daniels, 70 Conn. App. 649, 656 (2002), §§ 2.1, 3.2
Iadarola v. Iadarola, No. FA98 035 65 52 S (Aug. 10, 2001), 2001 Ct. Sup. 10975, 10976, 2001 WL 1044627, Table 8
In re Alexander V., 223 Conn. 557, 566, 613 A.2d 780 (1992), § 1.7b
In Re Bruce R., 234 Conn. 194, 209, 662 A.2d 107 (1995), § 1.3
In re Eden, 250 Conn. 674, 694, 741 A.2d 873 (1999), § 1.7c
In Re Emmanuel M., 43 Conn. Sup. 108, 648 A.2d 904 (1993), §§ 1.7, 1.7c
In re Juvenile Appeal (Anonymous), 177 Conn. 648, 671 420 A.2d 875 (1979), § 1.7
In re Juvenile Appeal (Docket No. 10155), 187 Conn. 431, 435, 446 A.2d 808 (1982), §§ 1.7, 1.7b, 1.7c
In re Luke, 40 Conn. Supp. 316, 326-327, 498 A.2d 1054 (1985), § 1.7a
In re Nicolina T., 9 Conn. App. 598, 606, 520 A.2d 639 (1987), §§ 1.7a, 1.7d
In The Interests of Jaisean M., 2002 Ct. Sup. 5787, 5789, 2002 WL 1156030 (May 3, 2002), § 1.7c
Kaplan v. Kaplan, 185 Conn. 42, 45-46, 440 A.2d 252 (1981), § 2.3
Keays v. Keays, No. FA 93-0355163 S (Mar. 19, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 3569, 3571, 2002 WL 532425, Table 8
Knock v. Knock, 224 Conn. 776, 788, 621 A.2d 267 (1993), § 1.4
Laspina-Williams v. Laspina-Williams, 46 Conn. Supp. 165, 171, 742 A.2d 840 (1999), § 1.5

Lehr v. Robertson, 463 U.S. 248, 103 S.Ct. 2985, 77 L.Ed. 2d 614 (1983), §§ 1.1, 1.8

Marchiano v. Marchiano, No. FA96 0156039 S (Nov. 28, 1997), 1997 Ct. Sup. 11568, 11569, 1997 WL 753406, Table 6

Marvin v. Marvin, 18 Cal. 3d 660, 665, 134 Cal. Rptr. 815, 557 P.2d 106 (1976), §§ 3.1, 3.3, 3.3a

Mason v. Mason, No. 30 06 62 (Nov. 8, 1991), 1991 Ct. Sup. 9485, 9490-91, 1991 WL 240727, Table 6

Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 334, 96 S.Ct. 893, 47 L.Ed.2d 18 (1976), §§ 1.7b, 1.7c

McAnerney v. McAnerney, 165 Conn. 277, 287, 334 A.2d 437 (1973), § 2.3

McGaffin v. Roberts, 193 Conn. 393, 407, 479 A.2d 176 (1984), *cert. denied*, 470 U.S. 1050, 105 S.Ct. 1747, 84 L.Ed. 2d 813 (U.S. 1985), § 1.6

Mihalyak v. Mihalyak, 30 Conn. App. 516, 521, 620 A.2d 1327 (1993), § 2.3

Morson v. Morson, No. FA99 0175656 S (Sep. 13, 2001), 2001 Ct. Sup. 12743, 2001 WL 1200315, Table 6

Mullins v. Oregon, 57 F.3d 789 (9th Circuit 1995), § 1.8

Paul v. Paul, No. FA93 0117672 S (Sep. 29, 1994), 1994 Ct. Sup. 9738, 9741-9742, 1994 WL 564051, Table 6

Posey v. Yandell, 26 Conn. Supp. 320, 323, 222 A.2d 747 (1966), § 1.6

Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166, 64 S. Ct. 438, 88 L. Ed. 645 (1944), § 1.7a

Quilloin v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 246, 98 S.Ct. 549, 54 L.Ed.2d 511 (1978), §§ 1.1, 1.7a

Raymond v. Raymond, 165 Conn. 735, 742, 345 A.2d 48 (1974), § 1.5

Ridgeway v. Ridgeway, 180 Conn. 533, 541, 429 A.2d 801 (1980), §§ 1.4, 1.5

Robinson v. Robinson, 187 Conn. 70, 72, 444 A.2d 234 (1982), § 2.2

Rosher v. Superior Court, 71 P.2d 918 (1937), § 1.3

Roth v. Weston, 259 Conn. 202, 789 A. 2d 431 (2002), §§ 1.1, 1.7a

Rudolewicz v. Rudolewicz, Superior Court, judicial district of Hartford at New Britain, Docket No. 410812, 1 C.S.C.R. 664, 666 (August 20, 1986), § 1.4

Santese (DeNunzio) v. Santese, FA 96-00727935 (Mar. 14, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 3272, 3274, 2002 WL 521393, Table 8

Santorsky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745, 753, 102 S.Ct. 1388, 71 L.Ed 2d 599 (1982), § 1.7

Sillman v. Sillman, 168 Conn. 144, 358 A.2d 150 (1975), § 1.3

Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, 92 S.Ct. 1208, 31 L.Ed.2d 551 (1972), §§ 1.1, 1.7, 1.7a

State v. Miranda, 245 Conn. 209, 222, 715 A.2d 680 (1998), § 1.3

Stevens v. Leone, 35 Conn. Supp. 237, 406 A.2d 402 (1979), §§ 1.2, 1.4

Stranko v. Stranko, No. FA93 030 11 74 (Feb. 28, 2002), 2002 Ct. Sup. 2028, 2030-2031, 2002 WL 450471, Table 8

Temple v. Meyer, 208 Conn. 404, 544 A.2d 629 (1988), § 1.5

Timm v. Timm, 195 Conn. 202, 207, 487 A.2d 191 (1985), § 1.3

Travis v. St. John, 176 Conn. 69, 72, 404 A.2d 885 (1978), § 3.3b

Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 120 S.Ct. 2054, 147 L.ed.2d 49, 56 (2000), title page, § 1.1

Unkelbach v. McNary, 244 Conn. 350, 357, 710 A.2d 717 (1998), § 1.3

Valente v. Valente, 180 Conn. 528, 532, 429 A.2d 964 (1980), § 1.3

Venuti v. Venuti, 185 Conn. 156, 159, 440 A.2d 878 (1981), § 2.2

Vibert v. Atchley, No. CV93-0346622 (May 23, 1996), 16 Conn. L. Repr. No. 19, 604 (July 8, 1996), 1996 WL 364777 (Conn. Super. 1996), Table 3 and § 3.4

Weidenbacher v. Duclos, 234 Conn. 51, 661 A.2d 988 (1995), § 1.1 and Table 1

Wolk v. Wolk, 191 Conn. 328, 332, 464 A.2d 780 (1983), Title page (Chapter 2)

Texts & Treatises

2 DISPUTED PATERNITY PROCEEDINGS (2002), §§ 1.1, 1.2

6 ARNOLD H. RUTKIN, GEN. ED., FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE (2001), § 1.8

8A ARNOLD H. RUTKIN ET AL., CONNECTICUT PRACTICE SERIES, FAMILY LAW AND PRACTICE WITH FORMS (2d ed. 2000), §§ 1.1-1.5, 2.1-2.3, 3.2, 3.3a, 3.4

ADOPTION LAW & PRACTICE (2001), §§ 1.1, 1.2, 1.7a, 1.7c, 1.7e

ALEXANDER LINDEY AND LOUIS I. PARLEY, LINDEY ON SEPARATION AGREEMENTS AND ANTENUPTIAL CONTRACTS (1999), §§ 3.2, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c, 3.4, 3.5

ANN M. HARALAMBIE, HANDLING CHILD CUSTODY, ABUSE AND ADOPTION CASES (1993), §§ 1.7a-1.7e

BARBARA KAHN STARK, FRIENDLY DIVORCE GUIDE FOR CONNECTICUT (1998), § 1.5

DONALD T. KRAMER, LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN (2d ed. 1994), § 1.5

FAMILY LAW PRACTICE IN CONNECTICUT(1996), §§ 1.4, 1.5, 2.3

GRAHAM DOUTHWAITE. UNMARRIED COUPLES AND THE LAW (1979), § 2.1

LIVING TOGETHER: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000), § 3.4

MIMI E. LYSTER, CHILD CUSTODY: BUILDING PARENTING AGREEMENTS THAT WORK (1996), § 1.4

PETER L. COSTAS, MANAGING ED., LAWYERS' DESKBOOK: A REFERENCE MANUAL, (2d ed. 2000), §§ 1.6, 1.8

RALPH H. FOLSOM & GAYLE B. WILHELM , INCAPACITY, POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND ADOPTION IN CONNECTICUT 3D (2001), §§ 1.6, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.8

RALPH WARNER ET AL. THE LIVING TOGETHER KIT: A LEGAL GUIDE FOR UNMARRIED COUPLES (10th ed. 2000), § 2.1

SAMUEL GREEN AND JOHN V. LONG. MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LAW AGREEMENTS (2d ed. 1984), §§ 2.1, 3.2, 3.3a, 3.3b, 3.3c

SANDRA MORGAN LITTLE, CHILD CUSTODY & VISITATION LAW AND PRACTICE (2002), vol. 5, §§ 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.7a, 1.7b, 1.7c, 1.7e

For the holdings of individual libraries see <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/lawlib/searchcat.htm>

General Index

- Adoption of child, § 1.8
- Adultery
 - during divorce, § 2.2 and Table 5, 6
 - following divorce, § 2.3 and Table 7
- Alimony, during divorce, § 2.2 and Table 5
- Alimony, effect of cohabitation on
- Alimony, following divorce, § 2.3 and Table 7
- Arbitration clause, Table 12
- Bank accounts (clause), Table 12
- Basic agreement (form), Table 12
 - breach of oral agreement, Table 9
- Checklist, § 12
- Children (clause), Table 12
- Cohabitation, definition, Title page (Chapter 2)
- Common law marriage, § 2.1
- Compelling disclosure of putative father, § 1.2
- Competency hearing, § 1.7b
- Constitution issues,
 - Father, unmarried, § 1.1
 - Mother, unmarried, § 1.2
- Constructive contracts, § 3.3a
- Constructive trust, § 3.3c
- Contempt, motion for, §§ 1.4, 1.5
- Custody**, § 1.4
- Custody**, Death of parent, effect on rights of
 - surviving parent, § 1.1
- Dating after filing for divorce, § 2.2 and Table 6
- Debts (clause), Table 12
- Disclosure clause, Table 12
- Domestic violence, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
- Drug use by parent, § 1.4
- Due process, § 1.7a
- Duty to support children, § 1.3
- Employment (clause), Table 12
- Enforcement of cohabitation agreements, §§ 2.1, 3.5
- Estate planning, unmarried cohabitants, § 2.1
- Ex parte orders, § 1.4
- Express contract**, § 3.3a
- Family Relations Office, § 1.4
- Father (definition), § 1.6
- Fathers, unmarried**, rights of, § 1.1
- Form of cohabitation agreement**, § 3.4
- Fourteenth amendment (U.S. Constitution), § 1.7a
- Grandparents (adoption), § 1.8
- Home purchase, unmarried, § 2.1
- Housing, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
- Implied contract**, § 3.3a and Table 10
- Implied joint venture**, § 3.3b
- Implied partnership**, § 3.3b
- Inheritance, Table 5
 - (clause), Table 12
- Invalid marriage, § 3.3a
- Joint venture vs. partnership, § 3.3b
- Living together contracts, § 2.1
- Living together vs. cohabitation, § 2.3
- Maintenance (definition), § 1.3
- Marital presumption, Table 1
- Meretricious, § 3.2
- Modification of alimony, cohabitation effect on, § 2.3
- Mother (definition), § 1.6
- Mothers, unmarried**, rights of § 1.2
- Motion for Modification and/or Termination of Periodic Alimony, Figure 1
- Names (clause), Table 12
- Necessities, child support, § 1.3
- Non-cohabiting parent, § 1.2
- Oral contract, § 3.2
- Parent (definition), § 1.6
- Parent as guardian, § 1.6
- Partnership vs. joint venture, definition, § 3.3b
- Pendente lite orders, §§ 1.4, 1.5
- Presumption re best interest of child to be in
- Privacy of family, § 1.1
- Privileged communication, unmarried
 - cohabitants, Table 4
- Property rights, § 3.2
- Property, joint (clause), Table 12
- Property, separate (clause), Table 12
- Public policy, violative of, § 3.2
- Quantum meruit**, § 3.3c
- Quasi-contract, §§ 3.2, 3.3c
- Recitals (clause), Table 12
- Recovery for services rendered, § 3.2
- Relative (definition), § 1.8
- Remarriage vs. cohabitation, § 2.1
- Remedies**, § 3.5
- Resumption of cohabitation following divorce, § 2.3
- Retroactive child support, § 1.3
- Rights
 - Father, § 1.1
 - Mother, § 1.2
- Sample clauses for cohabitation agreement, Table 12
- Sexual relationship, contracts for, § 3.2, 3.3a
- Smoking, § 1.4, 1.5
- Standby guardian, § 1.6

Support (clause), Table 12
Support of children, § 1.3
 Taxes (clause), Table 12
 Temporary living expenses, § 3.2
 Termination (clause), Table 12
 Termination of cohabitation agreements, § 2.1
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), § 1.7
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), Counsel, right to, § 1.7b
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), Equal protection of the law (TPR), §§ 1.7a, 1.7d
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), Notice, right to, §§ 1.1, 1.7e
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), Proof, standard of, § 1.7c
 Termination of parental rights (TPR), Remaining parent, Table 2
 Tort, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4
 Unjust enrichment, § 3.3c
Unmarried cohabitation, § 2.1
 Unmarried cohabitation, agreements, § 2.1
 Unmarried cohabitation, Child custody, § 2.1 and Table 4
 Unmarried cohabitation, Child visitation, § 2.1 and Table 4
 Unmarried cohabitation, contracts, § 2.1 and Table 4
 Unmarried cohabitation, property rights, § 2.1 and Table 4
 Unmarried cohabitation, unreported cases, Table 3
Validity of cohabitation agreements, § 3.2
 Visitation
Visitation, § 1.5
 (clause), Table 12
 Wills, unmarried cohabitants, § 2.1
 Zoning, unmarried cohabitants, Table 4